ADDENDUM

Table 1: State-Specific Allegations Supporting Count III Violation of State Antitrust Laws—Unlawful Price Fixing

State/Territory and Applicable	Type of Claim	Supporting Allegations	Relief Sought
Statute			
~ ~	Antitrust	Defendants have entered into an unlawful agreement in restraint of trade in violation of Ala. Code § 6-5-60 with respect to purchases of Granulated Sugar in Alabama by members of the Damages Class and/or purchases of Granulated Sugar by members of the Damages Class who resided in Alabama at the time of their purchase.  a. Defendants' combination or conspiracy had the following effects: (1) Granulated Sugar price competition was restrained, suppressed, and/or eliminated in Alabama; (2) Prices for Granulated Sugar sold by the Producer Defendants were raised, fixed, maintained, or stabilized to or at artificially high, noncompetitive levels throughout Alabama; (3) Commercial entities that purchased Granulated Sugar indirectly from the Producer Defendants or their according to the producer Defendants or the producer Defendants or the producer Defendants or the producer Defendants or the	Damages (to be trebled as permitted by Alabama's antitrust law), statutory damages. Ala. Code § 6-5-60.
		<ul> <li>indirectly from the Producer Defendants or their coconspirators were deprived of the benefits of free and open competition; (4) Members of the Damages Class paid supra-competitive, artificially inflated prices for Granulated Sugar.</li> <li>b. During the Class Period, Defendants' illegal conduct substantially affected Alabama commerce.</li> <li>c. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, members of the Damages Class were</li> </ul>	

State/Territory and Applicable Statute	Type of Claim	Supporting Allegations	Relief Sought
		<ul> <li>injured in their business and property and are threatened with further injury.</li> <li>d. Accordingly, Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class seek all forms of relief available under Ala. Code § 6-5-60.</li> </ul>	
Ariz. Rev. Stat. Ann. § 44-1402, et seq.	Antitrust	Defendants have entered into an unlawful agreement in restraint of trade in violation of Ariz. Rev. Stat. Ann. § 44-1402 with respect to purchases of Granulated Sugar in Arizona by Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class and/or purchases of Granulated Sugar by Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class who resided in Arizona at the time of their purchase.  a. Defendants' combination or conspiracy had the following effects: (1) Granulated Sugar price competition was restrained, suppressed, and/or eliminated in Arizona; (2) Prices for Granulated Sugar sold by the Producer Defendants were raised, fixed, maintained, or stabilized to or at artificially high, noncompetitive levels throughout Arizona; (3) Commercial entities that purchased Granulated Sugar indirectly from the Producer Defendants or their coconspirators were deprived of the benefits of free and open competition; and (4) Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages	Damages (to be trebled as permitted by Arizona's antitrust law), costs, attorneys' fees. Ariz. Rev. Stat. Ann. § 44-1408.

State/Territory and Applicable	Type of Claim	Supporting Allegations	Relief Sought
California  Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 16720, et seq.	Antitrust	Class paid supra-competitive, artificially inflated prices for Granulated Sugar.  b. During the Class Period, Defendants' illegal conduct substantially affected Arizona commerce.  c. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class were injured in their business and property and are threatened with further injury.  d. Accordingly, Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class seek all forms of relief available under Ariz. Rev. Stat. Ann. § 44-1402.  Defendants have entered into an unlawful agreement in restraint of trade in violation of Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 16720 with respect to purchases of Granulated Sugar in California by Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class and/or purchases of Granulated Sugar by Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class who resided in California at the time of their purchase.  a. Defendants' combination or conspiracy had the following effects: (1) Granulated Sugar price competition was restrained, suppressed, and/or eliminated in California; (2) Prices for Granulated Sugar sold by the Producer Defendants were raised,	Damages (to be trebled as permitted by California's antitrust law), costs, attorneys' fees. Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 16750.

State/Territory and Applicable Statute	Type of Claim	Supporting Allegations	Relief Sought
		fixed, maintained, or stabilized to or at artificially high, non-competitive levels throughout California; (3) Commercial entities that purchased Granulated Sugar indirectly from the Producer Defendants or their coconspirators were deprived of the benefits of free and open competition; and (4) Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class paid supra-competitive, artificially inflated prices for Granulated Sugar.  b. During the Class Period, Defendants' illegal conduct substantially affected California commerce.  c. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class were injured in their business and property and are threatened with further injury.  d. Accordingly, Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class seek all forms of relief available under Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 16720.	
Colorado	Antitrust	Defendants have entered into an unlawful agreement in restraint of trade in violation of Colo. Rev. Stat. § 6-4-104 with	Damages (to be trebled as permitted
Colo. Rev. Stat. §		respect to purchases of Granulated Sugar in Colorado by	by Colorado's
6-4-104, et seq.		members of the Damages Class and/or purchases of Granulated Sugar by members of the Damages Class who resided in Colorado at the time of their purchase.	antitrust law), expert fees, costs, attorneys'

State/Territory and Applicable Statute	Type of Claim	Supporting Allegations	Relief Sought
		<ul> <li>a. Defendants' combination or conspiracy had the following effects: (1) Granulated Sugar price competition was restrained, suppressed, and/or eliminated in Colorado; (2) Prices for Granulated Sugar sold by the Producer Defendants were raised, fixed, maintained, or stabilized to or at artificially high, noncompetitive levels throughout Colorado; (3) Commercial entities that purchased Granulated Sugar indirectly from the Producer Defendants or their coconspirators were deprived of the benefits of free and open competition; and (4) Members of the Damages Class paid supra-competitive, artificially inflated prices for Granulated Sugar.</li> <li>b. During the Class Period, Defendants' illegal conduct substantially affected Colorado commerce.</li> <li>c. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, members of the Damages Class were injured in their business and property and are threatened with further injury.</li> <li>d. Accordingly, Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class seek all forms of relief available under Colo. Rev. Stat. § 6-4-104.</li> </ul>	fees. Colo. Rev. Stat. § 6-4-115.
Connecticut	Antitrust	Defendants have entered into an unlawful agreement in restraint of trade in violation of Conn. Gen. Stat. § 35-26 with respect to purchases of Granulated Sugar in Connecticut by	Damages (to be trebled as permitted by Connecticut's

State/Territory and Applicable	Type of Claim	Supporting Allegations	Relief Sought
Statute			
Conn. Gen. Stat. § 35-26, <i>et seq</i> .		Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class and/or purchases of Granulated Sugar by	antitrust law), costs, attorneys' fees. Conn.
3 00 20,00 004		Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the	Gen. Stat. § 35-35.
		Damages Class who resided in Connecticut at the time of their	3
		purchase.	
		<ul> <li>a. Defendants' combination or conspiracy had the following effects: (1) Granulated Sugar price competition was restrained, suppressed, and/or eliminated in Connecticut; (2) Prices for Granulated Sugar sold by the Producer Defendants were raised, fixed, maintained, or stabilized to or at artificially high, non-competitive levels throughout Connecticut; (3) Commercial entities that purchased Granulated Sugar indirectly from the Producer Defendants or their coconspirators were deprived of the benefits of free and open competition; and (4) Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class paid supra-competitive, artificially inflated prices for Granulated Sugar.</li> <li>b. During the Class Period, Defendants' illegal conduct</li> </ul>	
		substantially affected Connecticut commerce.	
		c. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants'	
		unlawful conduct, Commercial Indirect Purchaser	
		Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class were	
		injured in their business and property and are	

State/Territory and Applicable Statute	Type of Claim	Supporting Allegations	Relief Sought
		threatened with further injury. d. Accordingly, Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class seek all forms of relief available under Conn. Gen. Stat. § 35-26.	
Del. Code Ann. tit. 6, § 2103, et seq.	Antitrust	Defendants have entered into an unlawful agreement in restraint of trade in violation of Del. Code Ann. tit. 6, § 2103 with respect to purchases of Granulated Sugar in Delaware by members of the Damages Class and/or purchases of Granulated Sugar by members of the Damages Class who resided in Delaware at the time of their purchase.  a. Defendants' combination or conspiracy had the following effects: (1) Granulated Sugar price competition was restrained, suppressed, and/or eliminated in Delaware; (2) Prices for Granulated Sugar sold by the Producer Defendants were raised, fixed, maintained, or stabilized to or at artificially high, non-competitive levels throughout Delaware; (3) Commercial entities that purchased Granulated Sugar indirectly from the Producer Defendants or their coconspirators were deprived of the benefits of free and open competition; and (4) Members of the Damages Class paid supra-competitive, artificially inflated prices for Granulated Sugar.  b. During the Class Period, Defendants' illegal conduct substantially affected Delaware commerce.	Damages, costs, expert witness fees, attorneys' fees. Del. Code Ann. tit. 6, § 2108.

State/Territory and Applicable Statute	Type of Claim	Supporting Allegations	Relief Sought
		<ul> <li>c. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, members of the Damages Class were injured in their business and property and are threatened with further injury.</li> <li>d. Accordingly, Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class seek all forms of relief available under Del. Code Ann. tit. 6, § 2103.</li> </ul>	
District of Columbia	Antitrust	Defendants have entered into an unlawful agreement in restraint of trade in violation of D.C. Code § 28-4502 with respect to purchases of Granulated Sugar in the District of	Damages (to be trebled as permitted by the District of
D.C. Code § 28- 4502, et seq.		Columbia by members of the Damages Class and/or purchases of Granulated Sugar by members of the Damages Class who resided in the District of Columbia at the time of their purchase.  a. Defendants' combination or conspiracy had the following effects: (1) Granulated Sugar price competition was restrained, suppressed, and/or eliminated in the District of Columbia; (2) Prices for Granulated Sugar sold by the Producer Defendants were raised, fixed, maintained, or stabilized to or at artificially high, non-competitive levels throughout the District of Columbia; (3) Commercial entities that purchased Granulated Sugar indirectly from the Producer Defendants or their co-conspirators were deprived of the benefits of free and open competition;	Columbia's antitrust law), costs, attorneys' fees. D.C. Code § 28-4508.

State/Territory	Type of	Supporting Allegations	Relief Sought
and Applicable Statute	Claim		
		<ul> <li>and (4) Members of the Damages Class paid supracompetitive, artificially inflated prices for Granulated Sugar.</li> <li>b. During the Class Period, Defendants' illegal conduct substantially affected the District of Columbia's commerce.</li> <li>c. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, members of the Damages Class were injured in their business and property and are threatened with further injury.</li> <li>d. Accordingly, Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class seek all forms of relief available under D.C. Code § 28-4502.</li> </ul>	
Hawaii	Antitrust	Defendants have entered into an unlawful agreement in restraint of trade in violation of Haw. Rev. Stat. Ann. § 480-4	Damages (to be trebled as permitted
Haw. Rev. Stat. Ann. § 480-4, et seq.		with respect to purchases of Granulated Sugar in Hawaii by members of the Damages Class and/or purchases of Granulated Sugar by members of the Damages Class who resided in Hawaii at the time of their purchase.  a. Defendants' combination or conspiracy had the following effects: (1) Granulated Sugar price competition was restrained, suppressed, and/or eliminated in Hawaii; (2) Prices for Granulated Sugar sold by the Producer Defendants were raised, fixed, maintained, or stabilized to or at artificially high, non-	by Hawaii's antitrust law), costs, attorneys' fees. Haw. Rev. Stat. Ann. § 480-13.

State/Territory	Type of	Supporting Allegations	Relief Sought
and Applicable Statute	Claim		
Statute		competitive levels throughout Hawaii; (3) Commercial entities that purchased Granulated Sugar indirectly from the Producer Defendants or their co-conspirators were deprived of the benefits of free and open competition; and (4) Members of the Damages Class paid supra-competitive, artificially inflated prices for Granulated Sugar.  b. During the Class Period, Defendants' illegal conduct substantially affected Hawaii's commerce.  c. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, members of the Damages Class were injured in their business and property and are threatened with further injury.  d. Accordingly, Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class seek all forms of relief available under Haw. Rev. Stat. Ann. § 480-4.	
Tillinois  740 Ill. Comp. Stat. Ann. 10/3, et seq.	Antitrust	Defendants have entered into an unlawful agreement in restraint of trade in violation of 740 Ill. Comp. Stat. Ann. 10/3 with respect to purchases of Granulated Sugar in Illinois by Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class and/or purchases of Granulated Sugar by Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class who resided in Illinois at the time of their purchase.  a. Defendants' combination or conspiracy had the	Damages (to be trebled as permitted by Illinois's antitrust law), costs, attorneys' fees. 740 Ill. Comp. Stat. Ann. 10/7.

State/Territory and Applicable Statute	Type of Claim	Supporting Allegations	Relief Sought
		following effects: (1) Granulated Sugar price competition was restrained, suppressed, and/or eliminated in Illinois; (2) Prices for Granulated Sugar sold by the Producer Defendants were raised, fixed, maintained, or stabilized to or at artificially high, noncompetitive levels throughout Illinois; (3) Commercial entities that purchased Granulated Sugar indirectly from the Producer Defendants or their co-conspirators were deprived of the benefits of free and open competition; and (4) Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class paid supra-competitive, artificially inflated prices for Granulated Sugar.  b. During the Class Period, Defendants' illegal conduct substantially affected Illinois's commerce.  c. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class were injured in their business and property and are threatened with further injury.  d. Accordingly, Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class seek all forms of relief available under 740 Ill. Comp. Stat. Ann. 10/3.	
Iowa	Antitrust	Defendants have entered into an unlawful agreement in restraint of trade in violation of Iowa Code § 553.4 with	Damages, exemplary damages, costs,

State/Territory and Applicable Statute	Type of Claim	Supporting Allegations	Relief Sought
Iowa Code § 553.4, et seq.		respect to purchases of Granulated Sugar in Iowa by members of the Damages Class and/or purchases of Granulated Sugar by members of the Damages Class who resided in Iowa at the time of their purchase.  a. Defendants' combination or conspiracy had the following effects: (1) Granulated Sugar price competition was restrained, suppressed, and/or eliminated in Iowa; (2) Prices for Granulated Sugar sold by the Producer Defendants were raised, fixed, maintained, or stabilized to or at artificially high, noncompetitive levels throughout Iowa; (3) Commercial entities that purchased Granulated Sugar indirectly from the Producer Defendants or their co-conspirators were deprived of the benefits of free and open competition; and (4) Members of the Damages Class paid supracompetitive, artificially inflated prices for Granulated Sugar.  b. During the Class Period, Defendants' illegal conduct substantially affected Iowa's commerce.  c. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, members of the Damages Class were injured in their business and property and are threatened with further injury.  d. Accordingly, Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class seek all forms of	attorneys' fees. Iowa Code § 553.12.

State/Territory and Applicable Statute	Type of Claim	Supporting Allegations	Relief Sought
		relief available under Iowa Code § 553.4.	
Kansas	Antitrust	Defendants have entered into an unlawful agreement in restraint of trade in violation of Kan. Stat. Ann. § 50-101 with	Damages (to be trebled as permitted
Kan. Stat. Ann. §		respect to purchases of Granulated Sugar in Kansas by	by Kansas' antitrust
50-101, et seq.		members of the Damages Class and/or purchases of Granulated Sugar by members of the Damages Class who resided in Kansas at the time of their purchase.  a. Defendants' combination or conspiracy had the following effects: (1) Granulated Sugar price competition was restrained, suppressed, and/or eliminated in Kansas; (2) Prices for Granulated Sugar sold by the Producer Defendants were raised, fixed, maintained, or stabilized to or at artificially high, non-competitive levels throughout Kansas; (3) Commercial entities that purchased Granulated Sugar indirectly from the Producer Defendants or their co-conspirators were deprived of the benefits of free and open competition; and (4) Members of the Damages Class paid supra-competitive, artificially inflated prices for Granulated Sugar.  b. During the Class Period, Defendants' illegal conduct substantially affected Kansas's commerce.  c. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants'	law), costs, attorneys' fees. Kan. Stat. Ann. § 50-161.
		substantially affected Kansas's commerce.	

State/Territory and Applicable Statute	Type of Claim	Supporting Allegations	Relief Sought
DM - in a	Atitum at	threatened with further injury.  d. Accordingly, Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class seek all forms of relief available under Kan. Stat. Ann. § 50-101.	Damas (4. L.
Me. Rev. Stat. Ann. Tit. 10 § 1101, et seq.	Antitrust	Defendants have entered into an unlawful agreement in restraint of trade in violation of Me. Rev. Stat. Ann. Tit. 10 § 1101 with respect to purchases of Granulated Sugar in Maine by Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class and/or purchases of Granulated Sugar by Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class who resided in Maine at the time of their purchase.  a. Defendants' combination or conspiracy had the following effects: (1) Granulated Sugar price competition was restrained, suppressed, and/or eliminated in Maine; (2) Prices for Granulated Sugar sold by the Producer Defendants were raised, fixed, maintained, or stabilized to or at artificially high, noncompetitive levels throughout Maine; (3) Commercial entities that purchased Granulated Sugar indirectly from the Producer Defendants or their co-conspirators were deprived of the benefits of free and open competition; and (4) Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class paid supra-competitive, artificially inflated prices for	Damages (to be trebled as permitted by Maine's antitrust law), costs, investigative costs, expert fees, attorneys' fees. Me. Rev. Stat. Ann. Tit. 10 § 1104.

State/Territory and Applicable Statute	Type of Claim	Supporting Allegations	Relief Sought
		<ul> <li>Granulated Sugar.</li> <li>b. During the Class Period, Defendants' illegal conduct substantially affected Maine's commerce.</li> <li>c. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class were injured in their business and property and are threatened with further injury.</li> <li>d. Accordingly, Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class seek all forms of relief available under Me. Rev. Stat. Ann. Tit. 10 § 1101.</li> </ul>	
Maryland	Antitrust	Defendants have entered into an unlawful agreement in restraint of trade in violation of Md. Code, Com. Law § 11-	Damages (to be trebled as permitted by
Md. Code, Com.		204 with respect to purchases of Granulated Sugar in	Maryland's antitrust
Law § 11-204, et		Maryland by members of the Damages Class and/or purchases	law), costs, attorneys'
seq.,		of Granulated Sugar by members of the Damages Class who	fees. Md. Code, Com.
		resided in Maryland at the time of their purchase.	Law § 11-209(b)(2)-
		a. Defendants' combination or conspiracy had the following effects: (1) Granulated Sugar price competition was restrained, suppressed, and/or eliminated in Maryland; (2) Prices for Granulated Sugar sold by the Producer Defendants were raised, fixed, maintained, or stabilized to or at artificially high, non-competitive levels throughout Maryland; (3)	(4).

State/Territory	Type of	Supporting Allegations	Relief Sought
and Applicable	Claim		
Statute			
		Commercial entities that purchased Granulated Sugar	
		indirectly from the Producer Defendants or their co-	
		conspirators were deprived of the benefits of free and	
		open competition; and (4) Members of the Damages Class paid supra-competitive, artificially inflated prices	
		for Granulated Sugar.	
		b. During the Class Period, Defendants' illegal conduct	
		substantially affected Maryland's commerce.	
		c. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants'	
		unlawful conduct, members of the Damages Class were	
		injured in their business and property and are	
		threatened with further injury.	
		d. Accordingly, Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs	
		and members of the Damages Class seek all forms of	
		relief available under Md. Code, Com. Law § 11-204.	
Michigan	Antitrust	Defendants have entered into an unlawful agreement in	Damages, costs,
		restraint of trade in violation of Mich. Comp. Laws, § 445.772	attorneys' fees. Mich.
Mich. Comp.		with respect to purchases of Granulated Sugar in Michigan by	Comp. Laws, §
Laws, § 445.772,		Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the	445.778(2).
et seq.		Damages Class and/or purchases of Granulated Sugar by	
		Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the	
		Damages Class who resided in Michigan at the time of their	
		purchase.	
		a. Defendants' combination or conspiracy had the	
		following effects: (1) Granulated Sugar price	

State/Territory and Applicable Statute	Type of Claim	Supporting Allegations	Relief Sought
		competition was restrained, suppressed, and/or eliminated in Michigan; (2) Prices for Granulated Sugar sold by the Producer Defendants were raised, fixed, maintained, or stabilized to or at artificially high, non-competitive levels throughout Michigan; (3) Commercial entities that purchased Granulated Sugar indirectly from the Producer Defendants or their coconspirators were deprived of the benefits of free and open competition; and (4) Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class paid supra-competitive, artificially inflated prices for Granulated Sugar.  b. During the Class Period, Defendants' illegal conduct substantially affected Michigan's commerce.  c. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class were injured in their business and property and are threatened with further injury.  d. Accordingly, Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class seek all forms of relief available under Mich. Comp. Laws, § 445.772.	
Minnesota	Antitrust	Defendants have entered into an unlawful agreement in restraint of trade in violation of Minn. Stat. § 325D.51 with respect to purchases of Granulated Sugar in Minnesota by	Damages (to be trebled as permitted by Minnesota's antitrust

State/Territory and Applicable Statute	Type of Claim	Supporting Allegations	Relief Sought
Minn. Stat. § 325D.51, et seq.		Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class and/or purchases of Granulated Sugar by Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class who resided in Minnesota at the time of their purchase.  a. Defendants' combination or conspiracy had the following effects: (1) Granulated Sugar price competition was restrained, suppressed, and/or eliminated in Minnesota; (2) Prices for Granulated Sugar sold by the Producer Defendants were raised, fixed, maintained, or stabilized to or at artificially high, non-competitive levels throughout Minnesota; (3) Commercial entities that purchased Granulated Sugar indirectly from the Producer Defendants or their coconspirators were deprived of the benefits of free and open competition; and (4) Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class paid supra-competitive, artificially inflated prices for Granulated Sugar.  b. During the Class Period, Defendants' illegal conduct substantially affected Minnesota's commerce.  c. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class were injured in their business and property and are	law), costs, attorneys' fees. Minn. Stat. § 325D.57.

State/Territory and Applicable Statute	Type of Claim	Supporting Allegations	Relief Sought
		threatened with further injury. d. Accordingly, Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class seek all forms of relief available under Minn. Stat. § 325D.51.	
Mississippi Miss. Code § 75- 21-1, et seq.	Antitrust	Defendants have entered into an unlawful agreement in restraint of trade in violation of Miss. Code § 75-21-1 with respect to purchases of Granulated Sugar in Mississippi by Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs members of the Damages Class and/or purchases of Granulated Sugar by Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class who resided in Mississippi at the time of their purchase.  a. Defendants' combination or conspiracy had the following effects: (1) Granulated Sugar price competition was restrained, suppressed, and/or eliminated in Mississippi; (2) Prices for Granulated Sugar sold by the Producer Defendants were raised, fixed, maintained, or stabilized to or at artificially high, non-competitive levels throughout Mississippi; (3) Commercial entities that purchased Granulated Sugar indirectly from the Producer Defendants or their coconspirators were deprived of the benefits of free and open competition; and (4) Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class paid supra-competitive, artificially inflated prices	Damages, civil penalties. Miss. Code § 75-21-9.

State/Territory and Applicable Statute	Type of Claim	Supporting Allegations	Relief Sought
Nebraska Neb. Rev. Stat. § 59-801, et seq.	Antitrust	for Granulated Sugar.  b. During the Class Period, Defendants' illegal conduct substantially affected Mississippi's commerce.  c. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class were injured in their business and property and are threatened with further injury.  d. Accordingly, Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class seek all forms of relief available under Miss. Code § 75-21-1.  Defendants have entered into an unlawful agreement in restraint of trade in violation of Neb. Rev. Stat. § 59-801 with respect to purchases of Granulated Sugar in Nebraska by members of the Damages Class and/or purchases of Granulated Sugar by members of the Damages Class who resided in Nebraska at the time of their purchase.  a. Defendants' combination or conspiracy had the following effects: (1) Granulated Sugar price competition was restrained, suppressed, and/or eliminated in Nebraska; (2) Prices for Granulated Sugar sold by the Producer Defendants were raised, fixed, maintained, or stabilized to or at artificially high, noncompetitive levels throughout Nebraska; (3) Commercial entities that purchased Granulated Sugar	Damages, costs, attorneys' fees. Neb. Rev. Stat. § 59-821.

State/Territory and Applicable Statute	Type of Claim	Supporting Allegations	Relief Sought
Nevada Nev. Rev. Stat. §	Antitrust	indirectly from the Producer Defendants or their co- conspirators were deprived of the benefits of free and open competition; and (4) Members of the Damages Class paid supra-competitive, artificially inflated prices for Granulated Sugar.  b. During the Class Period, Defendants' illegal conduct substantially affected Nebraska's commerce.  c. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, members of the Damages Class were injured in their business and property and are threatened with further injury.  d. Accordingly, Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class seek all forms of relief available under Neb. Rev. Stat. § 59-801.  Defendants have entered into an unlawful agreement in restraint of trade in violation of Nev. Rev. Stat. § 598A.060 with respect to purchases of Granulated Sugar in Nevada by	Damages (to be trebled as permitted by Nevada's antitrust
Nev. Rev. Stat. § 598A.060, et seq.		with respect to purchases of Granulated Sugar in Nevada by members of the Damages Class and/or purchases of Granulated Sugar by members of the Damages Class who resided in Nevada at the time of their purchase.  a. Defendants' combination or conspiracy had the following effects: (1) Granulated Sugar price competition was restrained, suppressed, and/or eliminated in Nevada; (2) Prices for Granulated Sugar sold by the Producer Defendants were raised, fixed,	law), costs, attorneys' fees. Nev. Rev. Stat. § 598A.210.

State/Territory and Applicable	Type of Claim	Supporting Allegations	Relief Sought
Statute		maintained, or stabilized to or at artificially high, non- competitive levels throughout Nevada; (3) Commercial entities that purchased Granulated Sugar indirectly from the Producer Defendants or their co-conspirators were deprived of the benefits of free and open competition; and (4) Members of the Damages Class paid supra-competitive, artificially inflated prices for Granulated Sugar.  b. During the Class Period, Defendants' illegal conduct substantially affected Nevada's commerce.  c. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, members of the Damages Class were injured in their business and property and are threatened with further injury.  d. Accordingly, Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class seek all forms of relief available under Nev. Rev. Stat. § 598A.060.	
New Hampshire	Antitrust	Defendants have entered into an unlawful agreement in restraint of trade in violation of N.H. Rev. Stat. § 356:2 with	Damages (to be trebled as permitted
N.H. Rev. Stat. § 356:2, <i>et seq</i> .		respect to purchases of Granulated Sugar in New Hampshire by members of the Damages Class and/or purchases of Granulated Sugar by members of the Damages Class who resided in New Hampshire at the time of their purchase.  a. Defendants' combination or conspiracy had the following effects: (1) Granulated Sugar price	by New Hampshire's antitrust law), costs, attorneys' fees. N.H. Rev. Stat. § 356:11.

State/Territory and Applicable	Type of Claim	Supporting Allegations	Relief Sought
Statute			
		competition was restrained, suppressed, and/or eliminated in New Hampshire; (2) Prices for Granulated Sugar sold by the Producer Defendants were raised, fixed, maintained, or stabilized to or at artificially high, non-competitive levels throughout New Hampshire; (3) Commercial entities that purchased Granulated Sugar indirectly from the Producer Defendants or their co-conspirators were deprived of the benefits of free and open competition; and (4) Members of the Damages Class paid supracompetitive, artificially inflated prices for Granulated Sugar.  b. During the Class Period, Defendants' illegal conduct substantially affected New Hampshire's commerce.  c. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, members of the Damages Class were injured in their business and property and are threatened with further injury.  d. Accordingly, Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class seek all forms of relief available under N.H. Rev. Stat. § 356:2.	
New Jersey	Antitrust	Defendants have entered into an unlawful agreement in	Damages (to be
		restraint of trade in violation of N.J. Stat. Ann. § 56:9-3 with	trebled as permitted
N.J. Stat. Ann. §		respect to purchases of Granulated Sugar in New Jersey by	by New Jersey's
56:9-3, <i>et seq</i> .		members of the Damages Class and/or purchases of	antitrust law), costs,

State/Territory and Applicable Statute	Type of Claim	Supporting Allegations	Relief Sought
		Granulated Sugar by members of the Damages Class who resided in New Jersey at the time of their purchase.  a. Defendants' combination or conspiracy had the following effects: (1) Granulated Sugar price competition was restrained, suppressed, and/or eliminated in New Jersey; (2) Prices for Granulated Sugar sold by the Producer Defendants were raised, fixed, maintained, or stabilized to or at artificially high, non-competitive levels throughout New Jersey; (3) Commercial entities that purchased Granulated Sugar indirectly from the Producer Defendants or their coconspirators were deprived of the benefits of free and open competition; and (4) Members of the Damages Class paid supra-competitive, artificially inflated prices for Granulated Sugar.  b. During the Class Period, Defendants' illegal conduct substantially affected New Jersey's commerce.  c. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, members of the Damages Class were injured in their business and property and are threatened with further injury.  d. Accordingly, Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class seek all forms of relief available under N.J. Stat. Ann. § 56:9-3.	attorneys' fees. N.J. Stat. Ann. § 56:9-12(a).

State/Territory and Applicable Statute	Type of Claim	Supporting Allegations	Relief Sought
	Antitrust	Defendants have entered into an unlawful agreement in restraint of trade in violation of N.M. Stat. Ann. § 57-1-3 with respect to purchases of Granulated Sugar in New Mexico by members of the Damages Class and/or purchases of Granulated Sugar by members of the Damages Class who resided in New Mexico at the time of their purchase.  a. Defendants' combination or conspiracy had the following effects: (1) Granulated Sugar price competition was restrained, suppressed, and/or eliminated in New Mexico; (2) Prices for Granulated Sugar sold by the Producer Defendants were raised, fixed, maintained, or stabilized to or at artificially high, non-competitive levels throughout New Mexico; (3) Commercial entities that purchased Granulated Sugar indirectly from the Producer Defendants or their coconspirators were deprived of the benefits of free and open competition; and (4) Members of the Damages	Damages (to be trebled as permitted by New Mexico's antitrust law), costs, attorneys' fees. N.M. Stat. Ann. § 57-1-3(A).
		<ul> <li>Class paid supra-competitive, artificially inflated prices for Granulated Sugar.</li> <li>b. During the Class Period, Defendants' illegal conduct substantially affected New Mexico's commerce.</li> <li>c. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, members of the Damages Class were injured in their business and property and are threatened with further injury.</li> </ul>	

State/Territory and Applicable Statute	Type of Claim	Supporting Allegations	Relief Sought
		d. Accordingly, Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class seek all forms of relief available under N.M. Stat. Ann. § 57-1-3.	
New York  N.Y. Gen. Bus. Law § 340, et seq.	Antitrust	Defendants have entered into an unlawful agreement in restraint of trade in violation of N.Y. Gen. Bus. Law § 340 with respect to purchases of Granulated Sugar in New York by Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class and/or purchases of Granulated Sugar by Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class who resided in New York at the time of their purchase.  a. Defendants' combination or conspiracy had the following effects: (1) Granulated Sugar price competition was restrained, suppressed, and/or eliminated in New York; (2) Prices for Granulated Sugar sold by the Producer Defendants were raised, fixed, maintained, or stabilized to or at artificially high, non-competitive levels throughout New York; (3) Commercial entities that purchased Granulated Sugar indirectly from the Producer Defendants or their coconspirators were deprived of the benefits of free and open competition; and (4) Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class paid supra-competitive, artificially inflated prices for Granulated Sugar.	Damages (to be trebled as permitted by New York's antitrust law), costs, attorneys' fees. N.Y. Gen. Bus. Law § 340(5).

State/Territory and Applicable	Type of Claim	Supporting Allegations	Relief Sought
Statute	Ciuiii		
North Carolina  N.C. Gen. Stat. § 75-1, et seq.	Antitrust	<ul> <li>b. During the Class Period, Defendants' illegal conduct substantially affected New York's commerce.</li> <li>c. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class were injured in their business and property and are threatened with further injury.</li> <li>d. Accordingly, Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class seek all forms of relief available under N.Y. Gen. Bus. Law § 340.</li> <li>Defendants have entered into an unlawful agreement in restraint of trade in violation of N.C. Gen. Stat. § 75-1 with respect to purchases of Granulated Sugar in North Carolina by Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class and/or purchases of Granulated Sugar by Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class who resided in North Carolina at the time of their purchase.</li> <li>a. Defendants' combination or conspiracy had the following effects: (1) Granulated Sugar price competition was restrained, suppressed, and/or eliminated in North Carolina; (2) Prices for Granulated Sugar sold by the Producer Defendants were raised, fixed, maintained, or stabilized to or at artificially high, non-competitive levels throughout North Carolina; (3)</li> </ul>	Damages (to be trebled as permitted by North Carolina's antitrust law), costs, attorneys' fees. N.C. Gen. Stat. §§ 75-16, 16.1

State/Territory and Applicable	Type of Claim	Supporting Allegations	Relief Sought
Statute			
		Commercial entities that purchased Granulated Sugar indirectly from the Producer Defendants or their coconspirators were deprived of the benefits of free and open competition; and (4) Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class paid supra-competitive, artificially inflated prices for Granulated Sugar.  b. During the Class Period, Defendants' illegal conduct substantially affected North Carolina's commerce.  c. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class were injured in their business and property and are threatened with further injury.  d. Accordingly, Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class seek all forms of relief available under N.C. Gen. Stat. § 75-1.	
North Dakota	Antitrust	Defendants have entered into an unlawful agreement in restraint of trade in violation of N.D. Cent. Code § 51-08.1-02	Damages (to be trebled as permitted
N.D. Cent. Code		with respect to purchases of Granulated Sugar in North Dakota	by North Dakota's
§ 51-08.1-02, et		by Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of	antitrust law), costs,
seq.		the Damages Class and/or purchases of Granulated Sugar by	attorneys' fees. N.D.
		Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the	Cent. Code § 51-08.1-
		Damages Class who resided in North Dakota at the time of	08.
		their purchase.	

State/Territory and Applicable Statute	Type of Claim	Supporting Allegations	Relief Sought
		<ul> <li>a. Defendants' combination or conspiracy had the following effects: (1) Granulated Sugar price competition was restrained, suppressed, and/or eliminated in North Dakota; (2) Prices for Granulated Sugar sold by the Producer Defendants were raised, fixed, maintained, or stabilized to or at artificially high, non-competitive levels throughout North Dakota; (3) Commercial entities that purchased Granulated Sugar indirectly from the Producer Defendants or their coconspirators were deprived of the benefits of free and open competition; and (4) Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class paid supra-competitive, artificially inflated prices for Granulated Sugar.</li> <li>b. During the Class Period, Defendants' illegal conduct substantially affected North Dakota's commerce.</li> <li>c. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class were injured in their business and property and are threatened with further injury.</li> <li>d. Accordingly, Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class seek all forms of relief available under N.D. Cent. Code § 51-08.1-02.</li> </ul>	

State/Territory and Applicable Statute	Type of Claim	Supporting Allegations	Relief Sought
Oregon	Antitrust	Defendants have entered into an unlawful agreement in restraint of trade in violation of Or. Rev. Stat. § 646.725 with	Damages (to be trebled as permitted
Or. Rev. Stat. § 646.725, et seq.		respect to purchases of Granulated Sugar in Oregon by members of the Damages Class and/or purchases of Granulated Sugar by members of the Damages Class who resided in Oregon at the time of their purchase.  a. Defendants' combination or conspiracy had the following effects: (1) Granulated Sugar price competition was restrained, suppressed, and/or eliminated in Oregon; (2) Prices for Granulated Sugar sold by the Producer Defendants were raised, fixed, maintained, or stabilized to or at artificially high, noncompetitive levels throughout Oregon; (3) Commercial entities that purchased Granulated Sugar indirectly from the Producer Defendants or their co-conspirators were deprived of the benefits of free and open competition; and (4) Members of the Damages Class paid supra-competitive, artificially inflated prices for Granulated Sugar.  b. During the Class Period, Defendants' illegal conduct substantially affected Oregon's commerce.  c. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, members of the Damages Class were injured in their business and property and are threatened with further injury.	by Oregon's antitrust law), costs, expert fees, attorneys' fees. Or. Rev. Stat. § 646.780(1)(a), (3)(a).

Rhode Island Antitrus  R.I. Gen. Laws §	<ul> <li>d. Accordingly, Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class seek all forms of relief available under Or. Rev. Stat. § 646.725.</li> <li>Defendants have entered into an unlawful agreement in restraint of trade in violation of R.I. Gen. Laws § 6-36-4 with respect to purchases of Granulated Sugar in Rhode Island by members of the Damages Class and/or purchases of</li> </ul>	Damages (to be trebled as permitted by Rhode Island's
	restraint of trade in violation of R.I. Gen. Laws § 6-36-4 with respect to purchases of Granulated Sugar in Rhode Island by	trebled as permitted
R.I. Gen. Laws §		by Phode Island's
6-36-4, et seq.	Granulated Sugar by members of the Damages Class who resided in Rhode Island at the time of their purchase.  a. Defendants' combination or conspiracy had the following effects: (1) Granulated Sugar price competition was restrained, suppressed, and/or eliminated in Rhode Island; (2) Prices for Granulated Sugar sold by the Producer Defendants were raised, fixed, maintained, or stabilized to or at artificially high, non-competitive levels throughout Rhode Island; (3) Commercial entities that purchased Granulated Sugar indirectly from the Producer Defendants or their coconspirators were deprived of the benefits of free and open competition; and (4) Members of the Damages Class paid supra-competitive, artificially inflated prices for Granulated Sugar.  b. During the Class Period, Defendants' illegal conduct substantially affected Rhode Island's commerce.	antitrust law), costs, expert fees, attorneys' fees. R.I. Gen. Laws § 6-36-11(a).

State/Territory and Applicable Statute	Type of Claim	Supporting Allegations	Relief Sought
		unlawful conduct, members of the Damages Class were injured in their business and property and are threatened with further injury.  d. Accordingly, Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class seek all forms of relief available under R.I. Gen. Laws § 6-36-4.	
South Dakota  S.D. Codified Laws § 37-1-3.1, et seq.	Antitrust	Defendants have entered into an unlawful agreement in restraint of trade in violation of S.D. Codified Laws § 37-1-3.1 with respect to purchases of Granulated Sugar in South Dakota by members of the Damages Class and/or purchases of Granulated Sugar by members of the Damages Class who resided in South Dakota at the time of their purchase.  a. Defendants' combination or conspiracy had the following effects: (1) Granulated Sugar price competition was restrained, suppressed, and/or eliminated in South Dakota; (2) Prices for Granulated Sugar sold by the Producer Defendants were raised, fixed, maintained, or stabilized to or at artificially high, non-competitive levels throughout South Dakota; (3) Commercial entities that purchased Granulated Sugar indirectly from the Producer Defendants or their coconspirators were deprived of the benefits of free and open competition; and (4) Members of the Damages Class paid supra-competitive, artificially inflated prices for Granulated Sugar.	Damages (to be trebled as permitted by South Dakota's antitrust law), costs, expert fees, attorneys' fees. S.D. Codified Laws § 37-1-14.3.

	Relief Sought
b. During the Class Period, Defendants' illegal conduct substantially affected South Dakota's commerce.  c. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, members of the Damages Class were injured in their business and property and are threatened with further injury.  d. Accordingly, Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class seek all forms of relief available under S.D. Codified Laws § 37-1-3.1.  Defendants have entered into an unlawful agreement in restraint of trade in violation of Tenn. Code Ann. § 47-25-101 with respect to purchases of Granulated Sugar in Tennessee by members of the Damages Class and/or purchases of Granulated Sugar by members of the Damages Class who resided in Tennessee at the time of their purchase.  a. Defendants' combination or conspiracy had the following effects: (1) Granulated Sugar price competition was restrained, suppressed, and/or eliminated in Tennessee; (2) Prices for Granulated Sugar sold by the Producer Defendants were raised, fixed, maintained, or stabilized to or at artificially high, non-competitive levels throughout Tennessee; (3) Commercial entities that purchased Granulated Sugar indirectly from the Producer Defendants or their co-	Damages. Tenn. Code Ann. § 47-25-106(a).
t	b. During the Class Period, Defendants' illegal conduct substantially affected South Dakota's commerce.  c. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, members of the Damages Class were injured in their business and property and are threatened with further injury.  d. Accordingly, Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class seek all forms of relief available under S.D. Codified Laws § 37-1-3.1.  Defendants have entered into an unlawful agreement in restraint of trade in violation of Tenn. Code Ann. § 47-25-101 with respect to purchases of Granulated Sugar in Tennessee by members of the Damages Class and/or purchases of Granulated Sugar by members of the Damages Class who resided in Tennessee at the time of their purchase.  a. Defendants' combination or conspiracy had the following effects: (1) Granulated Sugar price competition was restrained, suppressed, and/or eliminated in Tennessee; (2) Prices for Granulated Sugar sold by the Producer Defendants were raised, fixed, maintained, or stabilized to or at artificially high, non-competitive levels throughout Tennessee; (3) Commercial entities that purchased Granulated Sugar

State/Territory and Applicable Statute	Type of Claim	Supporting Allegations	Relief Sought
Utah  Utah Code Ann. § 76-10-3104, et seq.	Antitrust	open competition; and (4) Members of the Damages Class paid supra-competitive, artificially inflated prices for Granulated Sugar.  b. During the Class Period, Defendants' illegal conduct substantially affected Tennessee's commerce.  c. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, members of the Damages Class were injured in their business and property and are threatened with further injury.  d. Accordingly, Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class seek all forms of relief available under Tenn. Code Ann. § 47-25-101.  Defendants have entered into an unlawful agreement in restraint of trade in violation of Utah Code Ann. § 76-10-3104 with respect to purchases of Granulated Sugar in Utah by members of the Damages Class and/or purchases of Granulated Sugar by members of the Damages Class who resided in Utah at the time of their purchase.  a. Defendants' combination or conspiracy had the following effects: (1) Granulated Sugar price competition was restrained, suppressed, and/or eliminated in Utah; (2) Prices for Granulated Sugar sold by the Producer Defendants were raised, fixed, maintained, or stabilized to or at artificially high, non-	Damages (to be trebled as permitted by Utah's antitrust law), costs, attorneys' fees. Utah Code Ann. § 76-10-3109.
		competitive levels throughout Utah; (3) Commercial	

State/Territory	Type of	Supporting Allegations	Relief Sought
and Applicable Statute	Claim		
Statute		entities that purchased Granulated Sugar indirectly from the Producer Defendants or their co-conspirators were deprived of the benefits of free and open competition; and (4) Members of the Damages Class paid supra-competitive, artificially inflated prices for Granulated Sugar.  b. During the Class Period, Defendants' illegal conduct substantially affected Utah's commerce.  c. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, members of the Damages Class were injured in their business and property and are threatened with further injury.  d. Accordingly, Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class seek all forms of relief available under Utah Code Ann. § 76-10-3104.	
Vermont	Antitrust	Defendants have entered into an unlawful agreement in restraint of trade in violation of 9 Vermont Stat. Ann. § 2453	Damages, exemplary damages (to be trebled
9 Vermont Stat. Ann. § 2453, et seq.		with respect to purchases of Granulated Sugar in Vermont by members of the Damages Class and/or purchases of Granulated Sugar by members of the Damages Class who resided in Vermont at the time of their purchase.  a. Defendants' combination or conspiracy had the following effects: (1) Granulated Sugar price competition was restrained, suppressed, and/or eliminated in Vermont; (2) Prices for Granulated Sugar	as permitted by Vermont's antitrust law), attorneys' fees. 9 Vermont Stat. Ann. § 2465.

State/Territory and Applicable Statute	Type of Claim	Supporting Allegations	Relief Sought
		sold by the Producer Defendants were raised, fixed, maintained, or stabilized to or at artificially high, non-competitive levels throughout Vermont; (3) Commercial entities that purchased Granulated Sugar indirectly from the Producer Defendants or their co-conspirators were deprived of the benefits of free and open competition; and (4) Members of the Damages Class paid supra-competitive, artificially inflated prices for Granulated Sugar.  b. During the Class Period, Defendants' illegal conduct substantially affected Vermont's commerce.  c. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, members of the Damages Class were injured in their business and property and are threatened with further injury.  d. Accordingly, Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class seek all forms of relief available under 9 Vermont Stat. Ann. § 2453.	
West Virginia	Antitrust	Defendants have entered into an unlawful agreement in restraint of trade in violation of W. Va. Code § 47-18-3 with	Damages (to be trebled as permitted
W. Va. Code §		respect to purchases of Granulated Sugar in West Virginia by	by West Virginia's
47-18-3, et seq.		members of the Damages Class and/or purchases of Granulated Sugar by members of the Damages Class who	antitrust law), costs, attorneys' fees. W. Va.
		resided in West Virginia at the time of their purchase.  a. Defendants' combination or conspiracy had the	Code § 47-18-9.

State/Territory	Type of Claim	Supporting Allegations	Relief Sought
and Applicable Statute	Ciaiiii		
		following effects: (1) Granulated Sugar price competition was restrained, suppressed, and/or eliminated in West Virginia; (2) Prices for Granulated Sugar sold by the Producer Defendants were raised, fixed, maintained, or stabilized to or at artificially high, non-competitive levels throughout West Virginia; (3) Commercial entities that purchased Granulated Sugar indirectly from the Producer Defendants or their coconspirators were deprived of the benefits of free and open competition; and (4) Members of the Damages Class paid supra-competitive, artificially inflated prices for Granulated Sugar.  b. During the Class Period, Defendants' illegal conduct substantially affected West Virginia's commerce.  c. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, members of the Damages Class were injured in their business and property and are threatened with further injury.  d. Accordingly, Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class seek all forms of relief available under W. Va. Code § 47-18-3.	
Wisconsin	Antitrust	Defendants have entered into an unlawful agreement in	Damages (to be
Wis Stat 8		restraint of trade in violation of Wis. Stat. § 133.03 with respect to purchases of Granulated Sugar in Wisconsin by	trebled as permitted by Wisconsin's
Wis. Stat. § 133.03, <i>et seq</i> .		Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the	antitrust law), costs,
133.03, et seq.		Commercial municer i urchasel Flamuns and members of the	antitust law j, costs,

State/Territory and Applicable Statute	Type of Claim	Supporting Allegations	Relief Sought
		Damages Class and/or purchases of Granulated Sugar by Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class who resided in Wisconsin at the time of their purchase.  a. Defendants' combination or conspiracy had the following effects: (1) Granulated Sugar price competition was restrained, suppressed, and/or eliminated in Wisconsin; (2) Prices for Granulated Sugar sold by the Producer Defendants were raised, fixed, maintained, or stabilized to or at artificially high, non-competitive levels throughout Wisconsin; (3) Commercial entities that purchased Granulated Sugar indirectly from the Producer Defendants or their coconspirators were deprived of the benefits of free and open competition; and (4) Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class paid supra-competitive, artificially inflated prices for Granulated Sugar.  b. During the Class Period, Defendants' illegal conduct substantially affected Wisconsin's commerce.  c. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class were injured in their business and property and are threatened with further injury.	attorneys' fees. Wis. Stat. § 133.18(1)(a).

## CASE 0:24-cv-01292-JWB-DTS Doc. 51-1 Filed 03/14/25 Page 39 of 114

State/Territory and Applicable Statute	Type of Claim	Supporting Allegations	Relief Sought
		d. Accordingly, Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs	
		and members of the Damages Class seek all forms of relief available under Wis. Stat. § 133.03.	

Table 2: State-Specific Allegations Supporting Count IV Violation of State Antitrust Laws— Unlawful Information Exchanges

State/Territory	Type of	Supporting Allegations	Relief Sought
and Applicable	Claim		
Statute			
Alabama	Antitrust	Defendants have entered into an unlawful agreement in	Damages (to be
		restraint of trade in violation of Ala. Code § 6-5-60 with	trebled as permitted
Ala. Code § 6-5-		respect to purchases of Granulated Sugar in Alabama by	by Alabama's antitrust
60, <i>et seq</i> .		members of the Damages Class and/or purchases of	law), statutory
		Granulated Sugar by members of the Damages Class who	damages. Ala. Code §
		resided in Alabama at the time of their purchase.	6-5-60.
		a. Defendants' combination or conspiracy had the	
		following effects: (1) Granulated Sugar price	
		competition was restrained, suppressed, and/or	
		eliminated in Alabama; (2) Prices for Granulated Sugar	
		sold by the Producer Defendants were raised, fixed,	
		maintained, or stabilized to or at artificially high, non-	
		competitive levels throughout Alabama; (3)	
		Commercial entities that purchased Granulated Sugar	
		indirectly from the Producer Defendants or their co-	
		conspirators were deprived of the benefits of free and	
		open competition; and (4) Members of the Damages	
		Class paid supra-competitive, artificially inflated prices	
		for Granulated Sugar.	
		b. During the Class Period, Defendants' illegal conduct	
		substantially affected Alabama commerce.	
		c. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants'	
		unlawful conduct, members of the Damages Class were	
		injured in their business and property and are	

State/Territory and Applicable Statute	Type of Claim	Supporting Allegations	Relief Sought
		threatened with further injury.  d. Accordingly, Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class seek all forms of relief available under Ala. Code § 6-5-60.	
Ariz. Rev. Stat. Ann. § 44-1402, et seq.	Antitrust	Defendants have entered into an unlawful agreement in restraint of trade in violation of Ariz. Rev. Stat. Ann. § 44-1402 with respect to purchases of Granulated Sugar in Arizona by Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class and/or purchases of Granulated Sugar by Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class who resided in Arizona at the time of their purchase.  a. Defendants' combination or conspiracy had the following effects: (1) Granulated Sugar price competition was restrained, suppressed, and/or eliminated in Arizona; (2) Prices for Granulated Sugar sold by the Producer Defendants were raised, fixed, maintained, or stabilized to or at artificially high, noncompetitive levels throughout Arizona; (3) Commercial entities that purchased Granulated Sugar indirectly from the Producer Defendants or their coconspirators were deprived of the benefits of free and open competition; and (4) Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class paid supra-competitive, artificially inflated prices	Damages (to be trebled as permitted by Arizona's antitrust law), costs, attorneys' fees. Ariz. Rev. Stat. Ann. § 44-1408.

State/Territory and Applicable	Type of Claim	Supporting Allegations	Relief Sought
Statute	Ciaim		
California  Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 16720, et seq.	Antitrust	for Granulated Sugar.  b. During the Class Period, Defendants' illegal conduct substantially affected Arizona commerce.  c. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class were injured in their business and property and are threatened with further injury.  d. Accordingly, Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class seek all forms of relief available under Ariz. Rev. Stat. Ann. § 44-1402.  Defendants have entered into an unlawful agreement in restraint of trade in violation of Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 16720 with respect to purchases of Granulated Sugar in California by Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class and/or purchases of Granulated Sugar by Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class who resided in California at the time of their purchase.  a. Defendants' combination or conspiracy had the following effects: (1) Granulated Sugar price competition was restrained, suppressed, and/or eliminated in California; (2) Prices for Granulated Sugar sold by the Producer Defendants were raised, fixed, maintained, or stabilized to or at artificially high,	Damages (to be trebled as permitted by California's antitrust law), costs, attorneys' fees. Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 16750.

State/Territory and Applicable	Type of Claim	Supporting Allegations	Relief Sought
Statute		non-competitive levels throughout California; (3) Commercial entities that purchased Granulated Sugar indirectly from the Producer Defendants or their coconspirators were deprived of the benefits of free and open competition; and (4) Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class paid supra-competitive, artificially inflated prices for Granulated Sugar.  b. During the Class Period, Defendants' illegal conduct substantially affected California commerce.  c. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class were injured in their business and property and are threatened with further injury.  d. Accordingly, Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class seek all forms of	
Colorado	Antitrust	relief available under Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 16720.  Defendants have entered into an unlawful agreement in	Damages (to be
		restraint of trade in violation of Colo. Rev. Stat. § 6-4-104 with	trebled as permitted
Colo. Rev. Stat. §		respect to purchases of Granulated Sugar in Colorado by	by Colorado's
6-4-104, et seq.		members of the Damages Class and/or purchases of	antitrust law), expert
		Granulated Sugar by members of the Damages Class who	fees, costs, attorneys'
		resided in Colorado at the time of their purchase.	fees. Colo. Rev. Stat. §
		a. Defendants' combination or conspiracy had the	6-4-115.

Claim	Supporting Allegations	Relief Sought
Ciaiiii		
	following effects: (1) Granulated Sugar price competition was restrained, suppressed, and/or eliminated in Colorado; (2) Prices for Granulated Sugar sold by the Producer Defendants were raised, fixed, maintained, or stabilized to or at artificially high, non-competitive levels throughout Colorado; (3) Commercial entities that purchased Granulated Sugar indirectly from the Producer Defendants or their co-conspirators were deprived of the benefits of free and open competition; and (4) Members of the Damages Class paid supra-competitive, artificially inflated prices for Granulated Sugar.  b. During the Class Period, Defendants' illegal conduct substantially affected Colorado commerce.  c. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, members of the Damages Class were injured in their business and property and are threatened with further injury.  d. Accordingly, Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class seek all forms of relief available under Colo. Rev. Stat. § 6-4-104.	
Antitrust	Defendants have entered into an unlawful agreement in	Damages (to be
	ŭ .	trebled as permitted by Connecticut's
	• •	antitrust law), costs,
_		following effects: (1) Granulated Sugar price competition was restrained, suppressed, and/or eliminated in Colorado; (2) Prices for Granulated Sugar sold by the Producer Defendants were raised, fixed, maintained, or stabilized to or at artificially high, non-competitive levels throughout Colorado; (3) Commercial entities that purchased Granulated Sugar indirectly from the Producer Defendants or their co-conspirators were deprived of the benefits of free and open competition; and (4) Members of the Damages Class paid supra-competitive, artificially inflated prices for Granulated Sugar.  b. During the Class Period, Defendants' illegal conduct substantially affected Colorado commerce.  c. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, members of the Damages Class were injured in their business and property and are threatened with further injury.  d. Accordingly, Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class seek all forms of relief available under Colo. Rev. Stat. § 6-4-104.

State/Territory and Applicable Statute	Type of Claim	Supporting Allegations	Relief Sought
		Damages Class and/or purchases of Granulated Sugar by Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class who resided in Connecticut at the time of their purchase.  a. Defendants' combination or conspiracy had the following effects: (1) Granulated Sugar price competition was restrained, suppressed, and/or eliminated in Connecticut; (2) Prices for Granulated Sugar sold by the Producer Defendants were raised, fixed, maintained, or stabilized to or at artificially high, non-competitive levels throughout Connecticut; (3) Commercial entities that purchased Granulated Sugar indirectly from the Producer Defendants or their coconspirators were deprived of the benefits of free and open competition; and (4) Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class paid supra-competitive, artificially inflated prices for Granulated Sugar.  b. During the Class Period, Defendants' illegal conduct substantially affected Connecticut commerce.  c. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class were injured in their business and property and are threatened with further injury.	attorneys' fees. Conn. Gen. Stat. § 35-35.

State/Territory and Applicable Statute	Type of Claim	Supporting Allegations	Relief Sought
		d. Accordingly, Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class seek all forms of relief available under Conn. Gen. Stat. § 35-26.	
Delaware  Del. Code Ann. tit. 6, § 2103, et seq.	Antitrust	Defendants have entered into an unlawful agreement in restraint of trade in violation of Del. Code Ann. tit. 6, § 2103 with respect to purchases of Granulated Sugar in Delaware by members of the Damages Class and/or purchases of Granulated Sugar by members of the Damages Class who resided in Delaware at the time of their purchase.  a. Defendants' combination or conspiracy had the following effects: (1) Granulated Sugar price competition was restrained, suppressed, and/or eliminated in Delaware; (2) Prices for Granulated Sugar sold by the Producer Defendants were raised, fixed, maintained, or stabilized to or at artificially high, non-competitive levels throughout Delaware; (3) Commercial entities that purchased Granulated Sugar indirectly from the Producer Defendants or their coconspirators were deprived of the benefits of free and open competition; and (4) Members of the Damages Class paid supra-competitive, artificially inflated prices for Granulated Sugar.  b. During the Class Period, Defendants' illegal conduct	Damages, costs, expert witness fees, attorneys' fees. Del. Code Ann. tit. 6, § 2108.
		substantially affected Delaware commerce.  c. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants'	

State/Territory and Applicable Statute	Type of Claim	Supporting Allegations	Relief Sought
District of Columbia  D.C. Code § 28-4502, et seq.	Antitrust	unlawful conduct, members of the Damages Class were injured in their business and property and are threatened with further injury.  d. Accordingly, Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class seek all forms of relief available under Del. Code Ann. tit. 6, § 2103.  Defendants have entered into an unlawful agreement in restraint of trade in violation of D.C. Code § 28-4502 with respect to purchases of Granulated Sugar in the District of Columbia by members of the Damages Class and/or purchases of Granulated Sugar by members of the Damages Class who resided in the District of Columbia at the time of their purchase.  a. Defendants' combination or conspiracy had the following effects: (1) Granulated Sugar price competition was restrained, suppressed, and/or eliminated in the District of Columbia; (2) Prices for Granulated Sugar sold by the Producer Defendants were raised, fixed, maintained, or stabilized to or at artificially high, non-competitive levels throughout the District of Columbia; (3) Commercial entities that purchased Granulated Sugar indirectly from the	Damages (to be trebled as permitted by the District of Columbia's antitrust law), costs, attorneys' fees. D.C. Code § 28-4508.
		Producer Defendants or their co-conspirators were deprived of the benefits of free and open competition; and (4) Members of the Damages Class paid supra-	

State/Territory and Applicable	Type of Claim	Supporting Allegations	Relief Sought
Hawaii Haw. Rev. Stat. Ann. § 480-4, et seq.	Antitrust	competitive, artificially inflated prices for Granulated Sugar.  b. During the Class Period, Defendants' illegal conduct substantially affected the District of Columbia's commerce.  c. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, members of the Damages Class were injured in their business and property and are threatened with further injury.  d. Accordingly, Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class seek all forms of relief available under D.C. Code § 28-4502.  Defendants have entered into an unlawful agreement in restraint of trade in violation of Haw. Rev. Stat. Ann. § 480-4 with respect to purchases of Granulated Sugar in Hawaii by members of the Damages Class and/or purchases of Granulated Sugar by members of the Damages Class who resided in Hawaii at the time of their purchase.  a. Defendants' combination or conspiracy had the following effects: (1) Granulated Sugar price competition was restrained, suppressed, and/or eliminated in Hawaii; (2) Prices for Granulated Sugar sold by the Producer Defendants were raised, fixed, maintained, or stabilized to or at artificially high, noncompetitive levels throughout Hawaii; (3) Commercial	Damages (to be trebled as permitted by Hawaii's antitrust law), costs, attorneys' fees. Haw. Rev. Stat. Ann. § 480-13.

State/Territory	Type of	Supporting Allegations	Relief Sought
and Applicable Statute	Claim		
Statute		entities that purchased Granulated Sugar indirectly from the Producer Defendants or their co-conspirators were deprived of the benefits of free and open competition; and (4) Members of the Damages Class paid supra-competitive, artificially inflated prices for Granulated Sugar.  b. During the Class Period, Defendants' illegal conduct substantially affected Hawaii's commerce.  c. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, members of the Damages Class were injured in their business and property and are threatened with further injury.  d. Accordingly, Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class seek all forms of relief available under Haw. Rev. Stat. Ann. § 480-4.	
740 Ill. Comp. Stat. Ann. 10/3, et seq.	Antitrust	Defendants have entered into an unlawful agreement in restraint of trade in violation of 740 Ill. Comp. Stat. Ann. 10/3 with respect to purchases of Granulated Sugar in Illinois by Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class and/or purchases of Granulated Sugar by Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the	Damages (to be trebled as permitted by Illinois's antitrust law), costs, attorneys' fees. 740 Ill. Comp. Stat. Ann. 10/7.
		Damages Class who resided in Illinois at the time of their purchase.  a. Defendants' combination or conspiracy had the following effects: (1) Granulated Sugar price	Stat. AIIII. 10/ / .

State/Territory and Applicable Statute	Type of Claim	Supporting Allegations	Relief Sought
		competition was restrained, suppressed, and/or eliminated in Illinois; (2) Prices for Granulated Sugar sold by the Producer Defendants were raised, fixed, maintained, or stabilized to or at artificially high, noncompetitive levels throughout Illinois; (3) Commercial entities that purchased Granulated Sugar indirectly from the Producer Defendants or their co-conspirators were deprived of the benefits of free and open competition; and (4) Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class paid supra-competitive, artificially inflated prices for Granulated Sugar.  b. During the Class Period, Defendants' illegal conduct substantially affected Illinois's commerce.  c. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class were injured in their business and property and are threatened with further injury.  d. Accordingly, Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class seek all forms of relief available under 740 Ill. Comp. Stat. Ann. 10/3.	
Iowa	Antitrust	Defendants have entered into an unlawful agreement in restraint of trade in violation of Iowa Code § 553.4 with respect to purchases of Granulated Sugar in Iowa by members	Damages, exemplary damages, costs,

State/Territory and Applicable Statute	Type of Claim	Supporting Allegations	Relief Sought
Iowa Code § 553.4, et seq.		by members of the Damages Class who resided in Iowa at the time of their purchase.  a. Defendants' combination or conspiracy had the following effects: (1) Granulated Sugar price competition was restrained, suppressed, and/or eliminated in Iowa; (2) Prices for Granulated Sugar sold by the Producer Defendants were raised, fixed, maintained, or stabilized to or at artificially high, non-competitive levels throughout Iowa; (3) Commercial entities that purchased Granulated Sugar indirectly from the Producer Defendants or their co-conspirators were deprived of the benefits of free and open competition; and (4) Members of the Damages Class paid supracompetitive, artificially inflated prices for Granulated Sugar.  b. During the Class Period, Defendants' illegal conduct substantially affected Iowa's commerce.  c. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, members of the Damages Class were injured in their business and property and are threatened with further injury.  d. Accordingly, Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class seek all forms of relief available under Iowa Code § 553.4.	attorneys' fees. Iowa Code § 553.12.

State/Territory and Applicable Statute	Type of Claim	Supporting Allegations	Relief Sought
Kansas	Antitrust	Defendants have entered into an unlawful agreement in restraint of trade in violation of Kan. Stat. Ann. § 50-101 with	Damages (to be trebled as permitted
Kan. Stat. Ann. § 50-101, et seq.		respect to purchases of Granulated Sugar in Kansas by members of the Damages Class and/or purchases of Granulated Sugar by members of the Damages Class who resided in Kansas at the time of their purchase.  a. Defendants' combination or conspiracy had the following effects: (1) Granulated Sugar price competition was restrained, suppressed, and/or eliminated in Kansas; (2) Prices for Granulated Sugar sold by the Producer Defendants were raised, fixed, maintained, or stabilized to or at artificially high, noncompetitive levels throughout Kansas; (3) Commercial entities that purchased Granulated Sugar indirectly from the Producer Defendants or their co-conspirators were deprived of the benefits of free and open competition; and (4) Members of the Damages Class paid supra-competitive, artificially inflated prices for Granulated Sugar.  b. During the Class Period, Defendants' illegal conduct substantially affected Kansas's commerce.  c. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, members of the Damages Class were injured in their business and property and are threatened with further injury.	by Kansas' antitrust law), costs, attorneys' fees. Kan. Stat. Ann. § 50-161.

State/Territory and Applicable Statute	Type of Claim	Supporting Allegations	Relief Sought
		d. Accordingly, Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class seek all forms of relief available under Kan. Stat. Ann. § 50-101.	
Me. Rev. Stat. Ann. Tit. 10 § 1101, et seq.	Antitrust	Defendants have entered into an unlawful agreement in restraint of trade in violation of Me. Rev. Stat. Ann. Tit. 10 § 1101 with respect to purchases of Granulated Sugar in Maine by Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class and/or purchases of Granulated Sugar by Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class who resided in Maine at the time of their purchase.  a. Defendants' combination or conspiracy had the following effects: (1) Granulated Sugar price competition was restrained, suppressed, and/or eliminated in Maine; (2) Prices for Granulated Sugar sold by the Producer Defendants were raised, fixed, maintained, or stabilized to or at artificially high, noncompetitive levels throughout Maine; (3) Commercial entities that purchased Granulated Sugar indirectly from the Producer Defendants or their co-conspirators were deprived of the benefits of free and open competition; and (4) Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class paid	Damages (to be trebled as permitted by Maine's antitrust law), costs, investigative costs, expert fees, attorneys' fees. Me. Rev. Stat. Ann. Tit. 10 § 1104.
		supra-competitive, artificially inflated prices for Granulated Sugar.	

State/Territory and Applicable Statute	Type of Claim	Supporting Allegations	Relief Sought
Maryland  Md. Code, Com. Law § 11-204, et seq.,	Antitrust	<ul> <li>b. During the Class Period, Defendants' illegal conduct substantially affected Maine's commerce.</li> <li>c. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class were injured in their business and property and are threatened with further injury.</li> <li>d. Accordingly, Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class seek all forms of relief available under Me. Rev. Stat. Ann. Tit. 10 § 1101.</li> <li>Defendants have entered into an unlawful agreement in restraint of trade in violation of Md. Code, Com. Law § 11-204 with respect to purchases of Granulated Sugar in Maryland by members of the Damages Class and/or purchases of Granulated Sugar by members of the Damages Class who resided in Maryland at the time of their purchase.</li> <li>a. Defendants' combination or conspiracy had the following effects: (1) Granulated Sugar price competition was restrained, suppressed, and/or eliminated in Maryland; (2) Prices for Granulated Sugar sold by the Producer Defendants were raised, fixed, maintained, or stabilized to or at artificially high, non-competitive levels throughout Maryland; (3) Commercial entities that purchased Granulated Sugar</li> </ul>	Damages (to be trebled as permitted by Maryland's antitrust law), costs, attorneys' fees. Md. Code, Com. Law § 11-209(b)(2)-(4).

State/Territory and Applicable	Type of Claim	Supporting Allegations	Relief Sought
Michigan  Mich. Comp. Laws, § 445.772, et seq.	Antitrust	indirectly from the Producer Defendants or their co- conspirators were deprived of the benefits of free and open competition; and (4) Members of the Damages Class paid supra-competitive, artificially inflated prices for Granulated Sugar.  b. During the Class Period, Defendants' illegal conduct substantially affected Maryland's commerce.  c. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, members of the Damages Class were injured in their business and property and are threatened with further injury.  d. Accordingly, Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class seek all forms of relief available under Md. Code, Com. Law § 11-204.  Defendants have entered into an unlawful agreement in restraint of trade in violation of Mich. Comp. Laws, § 445.772 with respect to purchases of Granulated Sugar in Michigan by Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class and/or purchases of Granulated Sugar by Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class who resided in Michigan at the time of their purchase.  a. Defendants' combination or conspiracy had the following effects: (1) Granulated Sugar price	Damages, costs, attorneys' fees. Mich. Comp. Laws, § 445.778(2).
Mich. Comp. Laws, § 445.772,	Antitrust	injured in their business and property and are threatened with further injury.  d. Accordingly, Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class seek all forms of relief available under Md. Code, Com. Law § 11-204.  Defendants have entered into an unlawful agreement in restraint of trade in violation of Mich. Comp. Laws, § 445.772 with respect to purchases of Granulated Sugar in Michigan by Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class and/or purchases of Granulated Sugar by Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class who resided in Michigan at the time of their purchase.  a. Defendants' combination or conspiracy had the	attorneys' fees. Mich. Comp. Laws, §

State/Territory and Applicable	Type of Claim	Supporting Allegations	Relief Sought
Statute			
		eliminated in Michigan; (2) Prices for Granulated Sugar sold by the Producer Defendants were raised, fixed, maintained, or stabilized to or at artificially high, non-competitive levels throughout Michigan; (3) Commercial entities that purchased Granulated Sugar indirectly from the Producer Defendants or their coconspirators were deprived of the benefits of free and open competition; and (4) Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class paid supra-competitive, artificially inflated prices for Granulated Sugar.  b. During the Class Period, Defendants' illegal conduct substantially affected Michigan's commerce.  c. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class were injured in their business and property and are threatened with further injury.  d. Accordingly, Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class seek all forms of relief available under Mich. Comp. Laws, § 445.772.	
Minnesota	Antitrust	Defendants have entered into an unlawful agreement in	Damages (to be
Minn. Stat. §		restraint of trade in violation of Minn. Stat. § 325D.51 with respect to purchases of Granulated Sugar in Minnesota by	trebled as permitted by Minnesota's antitrust
325D.51, <i>et seq.</i>		Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the	law), costs, attorneys'

State/Territory and Applicable Statute	Type of Claim	Supporting Allegations	Relief Sought
		Damages Class and/or purchases of Granulated Sugar by Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class who resided in Minnesota at the time of their purchase.  a. Defendants' combination or conspiracy had the following effects: (1) Granulated Sugar price competition was restrained, suppressed, and/or eliminated in Minnesota; (2) Prices for Granulated Sugar sold by the Producer Defendants were raised, fixed, maintained, or stabilized to or at artificially high, non-competitive levels throughout Minnesota; (3) Commercial entities that purchased Granulated Sugar indirectly from the Producer Defendants or their coconspirators were deprived of the benefits of free and open competition; and (4) Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class paid supra-competitive, artificially inflated prices for Granulated Sugar.  b. During the Class Period, Defendants' illegal conduct substantially affected Minnesota's commerce.  c. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class were injured in their business and property and are threatened with further injury.	fees. Minn. Stat. § 325D.57.

State/Territory and Applicable Statute	Type of Claim	Supporting Allegations	Relief Sought
		d. Accordingly, Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class seek all forms of relief available under Minn. Stat. § 325D.51.	
Miss. Code § 75-21-1, et seq.	Antitrust	Defendants have entered into an unlawful agreement in restraint of trade in violation of Miss. Code § 75-21-1 with respect to purchases of Granulated Sugar in Mississippi by Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs members of the Damages Class and/or purchases of Granulated Sugar by Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class who resided in Mississippi at the time of their purchase.  a. Defendants' combination or conspiracy had the following effects: (1) Granulated Sugar price competition was restrained, suppressed, and/or eliminated in Mississippi; (2) Prices for Granulated Sugar sold by the Producer Defendants were raised, fixed, maintained, or stabilized to or at artificially high, non-competitive levels throughout Mississippi; (3) Commercial entities that purchased Granulated Sugar indirectly from the Producer Defendants or their coconspirators were deprived of the benefits of free and open competition; and (4) Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class paid supra-competitive, artificially inflated prices for Granulated Sugar.	Damages, civil penalties. Miss. Code § 75-21-9.

State/Territory and Applicable Statute	Type of Claim	Supporting Allegations	Relief Sought
Nebraska	Antitrust	<ul> <li>b. During the Class Period, Defendants' illegal conduct substantially affected Mississippi's commerce.</li> <li>c. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class were injured in their business and property and are threatened with further injury.</li> <li>d. Accordingly, Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class seek all forms of relief available under Miss. Code § 75-21-1.</li> </ul>	Damagas, aasts
Nebraska	Antitrust	Defendants have entered into an unlawful agreement in restraint of trade in violation of Neb. Rev. Stat. § 59-801 with	Damages, costs, attorneys' fees. Neb.
Neb. Rev. Stat. §		respect to purchases of Granulated Sugar in Nebraska by	Rev. Stat. § 59-821.
59-801, et seq.		members of the Damages Class and/or purchases of Granulated Sugar by members of the Damages Class who resided in Nebraska at the time of their purchase.  a. Defendants' combination or conspiracy had the following effects: (1) Granulated Sugar price competition was restrained, suppressed, and/or eliminated in Nebraska; (2) Prices for Granulated Sugar sold by the Producer Defendants were raised, fixed, maintained, or stabilized to or at artificially high, non-competitive levels throughout Nebraska; (3) Commercial entities that purchased Granulated Sugar indirectly from the Producer Defendants or their co-	

State/Territory and Applicable Statute	Type of Claim	Supporting Allegations	Relief Sought
		<ul> <li>conspirators were deprived of the benefits of free and open competition; and (4) Members of the Damages Class paid supra-competitive, artificially inflated prices for Granulated Sugar.</li> <li>b. During the Class Period, Defendants' illegal conduct substantially affected Nebraska's commerce.</li> <li>c. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, members of the Damages Class were injured in their business and property and are threatened with further injury.</li> <li>d. Accordingly, Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class seek all forms of relief available under Neb. Rev. Stat. § 59-801.</li> </ul>	
Nevada	Antitrust	Defendants have entered into an unlawful agreement in restraint of trade in violation of Nev. Rev. Stat. § 598A.060	Damages (to be trebled as permitted
Nev. Rev. Stat. § 598A.060, et seq.		with respect to purchases of Granulated Sugar in Nevada by members of the Damages Class and/or purchases of Granulated Sugar by members of the Damages Class who resided in Nevada at the time of their purchase.  a. Defendants' combination or conspiracy had the following effects: (1) Granulated Sugar price competition was restrained, suppressed, and/or eliminated in Nevada; (2) Prices for Granulated Sugar sold by the Producer Defendants were raised, fixed, maintained, or stabilized to or at artificially high, non-	by Nevada's antitrust law), costs, attorneys' fees. Nev. Rev. Stat. § 598A.210.

State/Territory and Applicable Statute	Type of Claim	Supporting Allegations	Relief Sought
		competitive levels throughout Nevada; (3) Commercial entities that purchased Granulated Sugar indirectly from the Producer Defendants or their co-conspirators were deprived of the benefits of free and open competition; and (4) Members of the Damages Class paid supra-competitive, artificially inflated prices for Granulated Sugar.  b. During the Class Period, Defendants' illegal conduct substantially affected Nevada's commerce.  c. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, members of the Damages Class were injured in their business and property and are threatened with further injury.  d. Accordingly, Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class seek all forms of relief available under Nev. Rev. Stat. § 598A.060.	
New Hampshire  N.H. Rev. Stat. § 356:2, et seq.	Antitrust	Defendants have entered into an unlawful agreement in restraint of trade in violation of N.H. Rev. Stat. § 356:2 with respect to purchases of Granulated Sugar in New Hampshire by members of the Damages Class and/or purchases of Granulated Sugar by members of the Damages Class who resided in New Hampshire at the time of their purchase.  a. Defendants' combination or conspiracy had the following effects: (1) Granulated Sugar price competition was restrained, suppressed, and/or	Damages (to be trebled as permitted by New Hampshire's antitrust law), costs, attorneys' fees. N.H. Rev. Stat. § 356:11.

State/Territory	Type of	Supporting Allegations	Relief Sought
and Applicable Statute	Claim		
		eliminated in New Hampshire; (2) Prices for Granulated Sugar sold by the Producer Defendants were raised, fixed, maintained, or stabilized to or at artificially high, non-competitive levels throughout New Hampshire; (3) Commercial entities that purchased Granulated Sugar indirectly from the Producer Defendants or their co-conspirators were deprived of the benefits of free and open competition; and (4) Members of the Damages Class paid supracompetitive, artificially inflated prices for Granulated Sugar.  b. During the Class Period, Defendants' illegal conduct substantially affected New Hampshire's commerce.  c. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, members of the Damages Class were injured in their business and property and are threatened with further injury.  d. Accordingly, Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class seek all forms of relief available under N.H. Rev. Stat. § 356:2.	
New Jersey	Antitrust	Defendants have entered into an unlawful agreement in	Damages (to be
N. I. Stat. Asset. C		restraint of trade in violation of N.J. Stat. Ann. § 56:9-3 with	trebled as permitted
N.J. Stat. Ann. §		respect to purchases of Granulated Sugar in New Jersey by	by New Jersey's
56:9-3, et seq.		members of the Damages Class and/or purchases of Granulated Sugar by members of the Damages Class who	antitrust law), costs, attorneys' fees. N.J.

State/Territory and Applicable Statute	Type of Claim	Supporting Allegations	Relief Sought
		resided in New Jersey at the time of their purchase.  a. Defendants' combination or conspiracy had the following effects: (1) Granulated Sugar price competition was restrained, suppressed, and/or eliminated in New Jersey; (2) Prices for Granulated Sugar sold by the Producer Defendants were raised, fixed, maintained, or stabilized to or at artificially high, non-competitive levels throughout New Jersey; (3) Commercial entities that purchased Granulated Sugar indirectly from the Producer Defendants or their coconspirators were deprived of the benefits of free and open competition; and (4) Members of the Damages Class paid supra-competitive, artificially inflated prices for Granulated Sugar.  b. During the Class Period, Defendants' illegal conduct substantially affected New Jersey's commerce.  c. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, members of the Damages Class were injured in their business and property and are threatened with further injury.  d. Accordingly, Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class seek all forms of relief available under N.J. Stat. Ann. § 56:9-3.	Stat. Ann. § 56:9- 12(a).
New Mexico	Antitrust	Defendants have entered into an unlawful agreement in restraint of trade in violation of N.M. Stat. Ann. § 57-1-3 with	• `

State/Territory and Applicable Statute	Type of Claim	Supporting Allegations	Relief Sought
N.M. Stat. Ann. § 57-1-3, et seq.		respect to purchases of Granulated Sugar in New Mexico by members of the Damages Class and/or purchases of Granulated Sugar by members of the Damages Class who resided in New Mexico at the time of their purchase.  a. Defendants' combination or conspiracy had the following effects: (1) Granulated Sugar price competition was restrained, suppressed, and/or eliminated in New Mexico; (2) Prices for Granulated Sugar sold by the Producer Defendants were raised, fixed, maintained, or stabilized to or at artificially high, non-competitive levels throughout New Mexico; (3) Commercial entities that purchased Granulated Sugar indirectly from the Producer Defendants or their coconspirators were deprived of the benefits of free and open competition; and (4) Members of the Damages Class paid supra-competitive, artificially inflated prices for Granulated Sugar.  b. During the Class Period, Defendants' illegal conduct substantially affected New Mexico's commerce.  c. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, members of the Damages Class were injured in their business and property and are threatened with further injury.  d. Accordingly, Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class seek all forms of	by New Mexico's antitrust law), costs, attorneys' fees. N.M. Stat. Ann. § 57-1-3(A).

State/Territory and Applicable Statute	Type of Claim	Supporting Allegations	Relief Sought
		relief available under N.M. Stat. Ann. § 57-1-3.	
New York	Antitrust	Defendants have entered into an unlawful agreement in restraint of trade in violation of N.Y. Gen. Bus. Law § 340 with	Damages (to be trebled as permitted
N.Y. Gen. Bus.		respect to purchases of Granulated Sugar in New York by	by New York's
Law § 340, et		Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the	antitrust law), costs,
seq.		Damages Class and/or purchases of Granulated Sugar by	attorneys' fees. N.Y.
		Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the	Gen. Bus. Law §
		Damages Class who resided in New York at the time of their	340(5).
		purchase.	
		a. Defendants' combination or conspiracy had the	
		following effects: (1) Granulated Sugar price competition was restrained, suppressed, and/or eliminated in New York; (2) Prices for Granulated Sugar sold by the Producer Defendants were raised, fixed, maintained, or stabilized to or at artificially high, non-competitive levels throughout New York; (3) Commercial entities that purchased Granulated Sugar indirectly from the Producer Defendants or their coconspirators were deprived of the benefits of free and open competition; and (4) Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class paid supra-competitive, artificially inflated prices for Granulated Sugar.	
		b. During the Class Period, Defendants' illegal conduct substantially affected New York's commerce.	

State/Territory and Applicable Statute	Type of Claim	Supporting Allegations	Relief Sought
		<ul> <li>c. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class were injured in their business and property and are threatened with further injury.</li> <li>d. Accordingly, Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class seek all forms of relief available under N.Y. Gen. Bus. Law § 340.</li> </ul>	
North Carolina	Antitrust	Defendants have entered into an unlawful agreement in restraint of trade in violation of N.C. Gen. Stat. § 75-1 with	Damages (to be trebled as permitted
N.C. Gen. Stat. § 75-1, et seq.		respect to purchases of Granulated Sugar in North Carolina by Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class and/or purchases of Granulated Sugar by Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class who resided in North Carolina at the time of their purchase.  a. Defendants' combination or conspiracy had the following effects: (1) Granulated Sugar price competition was restrained, suppressed, and/or eliminated in North Carolina; (2) Prices for Granulated Sugar sold by the Producer Defendants were raised, fixed, maintained, or stabilized to or at artificially high, non-competitive levels throughout North Carolina; (3) Commercial entities that purchased Granulated Sugar indirectly from the Producer Defendants or their co-	by North Carolina's antitrust law), costs, attorneys' fees. N.C. Gen. Stat. §§ 75-16, 16.1

State/Territory and Applicable	Type of Claim	Supporting Allegations	Relief Sought
Statute	Ciaim		
		conspirators were deprived of the benefits of free and open competition; and (4) Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class paid supra-competitive, artificially inflated prices for Granulated Sugar.  b. During the Class Period, Defendants' illegal conduct substantially affected North Carolina's commerce.  c. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class were injured in their business and property and are threatened with further injury.  d. Accordingly, Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class seek all forms of relief available under N.C. Gen. Stat. § 75-1.	
North Dakota	Antitrust	Defendants have entered into an unlawful agreement in	Damages (to be
N.D. Cent. Code § 51-08.1-02, et seq.		restraint of trade in violation of N.D. Cent. Code § 51-08.1-02 with respect to purchases of Granulated Sugar in North Dakota by Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class and/or purchases of Granulated Sugar by Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class who resided in North Dakota at the time of their purchase.  a. Defendants' combination or conspiracy had the following effects: (1) Granulated Sugar price	trebled as permitted by North Dakota's antitrust law), costs, attorneys' fees. N.D. Cent. Code § 51-08.1- 08.

State/Territory and Applicable Statute	Type of Claim	Supporting Allegations	Relief Sought
		competition was restrained, suppressed, and/or eliminated in North Dakota; (2) Prices for Granulated Sugar sold by the Producer Defendants were raised, fixed, maintained, or stabilized to or at artificially high, non-competitive levels throughout North Dakota; (3) Commercial entities that purchased Granulated Sugar indirectly from the Producer Defendants or their coconspirators were deprived of the benefits of free and open competition; and (4) Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class paid supra-competitive, artificially inflated prices for Granulated Sugar.  b. During the Class Period, Defendants' illegal conduct substantially affected North Dakota's commerce.  c. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class were injured in their business and property and are threatened with further injury.  d. Accordingly, Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class seek all forms of relief available under N.D. Cent. Code § 51-08.1-02.	
Oregon	Antitrust	Defendants have entered into an unlawful agreement in restraint of trade in violation of Or. Rev. Stat. § 646.725 with respect to purchases of Granulated Sugar in Oregon by	Damages (to be trebled as permitted by Oregon's antitrust

State/Territory and Applicable Statute	Type of Claim	Supporting Allegations	Relief Sought
Or. Rev. Stat. § 646.725, et seq.		members of the Damages Class and/or purchases of Granulated Sugar by members of the Damages Class who resided in Oregon at the time of their purchase.  a. Defendants' combination or conspiracy had the following effects: (1) Granulated Sugar price competition was restrained, suppressed, and/or eliminated in Oregon; (2) Prices for Granulated Sugar sold by the Producer Defendants were raised, fixed, maintained, or stabilized to or at artificially high, non-competitive levels throughout Oregon; (3) Commercial entities that purchased Granulated Sugar indirectly from the Producer Defendants or their co-conspirators were deprived of the benefits of free and open competition; and (4) Members of the Damages Class paid supra-competitive, artificially inflated prices for Granulated Sugar.  b. During the Class Period, Defendants' illegal conduct substantially affected Oregon's commerce.  c. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, members of the Damages Class were injured in their business and property and are threatened with further injury.  d. Accordingly, Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class seek all forms of relief available under Or. Rev. Stat. § 646.725.	law), costs, expert fees, attorneys' fees. Or. Rev. Stat. § 646.780(1)(a), (3)(a).

State/Territory and Applicable Statute	Type of Claim	Supporting Allegations	Relief Sought
Rhode Island	Antitrust	Defendants have entered into an unlawful agreement in restraint of trade in violation of R.I. Gen. Laws § 6-36-4 with	Damages (to be trebled as permitted
R.I. Gen. Laws § 6-36-4, et seq.		respect to purchases of Granulated Sugar in Rhode Island by members of the Damages Class and/or purchases of Granulated Sugar by members of the Damages Class who resided in Rhode Island at the time of their purchase.  a. Defendants' combination or conspiracy had the following effects: (1) Granulated Sugar price competition was restrained, suppressed, and/or eliminated in Rhode Island; (2) Prices for Granulated Sugar sold by the Producer Defendants were raised, fixed, maintained, or stabilized to or at artificially high, non-competitive levels throughout Rhode Island; (3) Commercial entities that purchased Granulated Sugar indirectly from the Producer Defendants or their coconspirators were deprived of the benefits of free and open competition; and (4) Members of the Damages Class paid supra-competitive, artificially inflated prices for Granulated Sugar.  b. During the Class Period, Defendants' illegal conduct substantially affected Rhode Island's commerce.  c. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, members of the Damages Class were injured in their business and property and are threatened with further injury.	by Rhode Island's antitrust law), costs, expert fees, attorneys' fees. R.I. Gen. Laws § 6-36-11(a).

State/Territory and Applicable Statute	Type of Claim	Supporting Allegations	Relief Sought
		d. Accordingly, Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class seek all forms of relief available under R.I. Gen. Laws § 6-36-4.	
South Dakota  S.D. Codified Laws § 37-1-3.1, et seq.	Antitrust	Defendants have entered into an unlawful agreement in restraint of trade in violation of S.D. Codified Laws § 37-1-3.1 with respect to purchases of Granulated Sugar in South Dakota by members of the Damages Class and/or purchases of Granulated Sugar by members of the Damages Class who resided in South Dakota at the time of their purchase.  a. Defendants' combination or conspiracy had the following effects: (1) Granulated Sugar price competition was restrained, suppressed, and/or eliminated in South Dakota; (2) Prices for Granulated Sugar sold by the Producer Defendants were raised, fixed, maintained, or stabilized to or at artificially high, non-competitive levels throughout South Dakota; (3) Commercial entities that purchased Granulated Sugar indirectly from the Producer Defendants or their coconspirators were deprived of the benefits of free and open competition; and (4) Members of the Damages Class paid supra-competitive, artificially inflated prices for Granulated Sugar.  b. During the Class Period, Defendants' illegal conduct substantially affected South Dakota's commerce.  c. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants'	Damages (to be trebled as permitted by South Dakota's antitrust law), costs, expert fees, attorneys' fees. S.D. Codified Laws § 37-1-14.3.

State/Territory and Applicable Statute	Type of Claim	Supporting Allegations	Relief Sought
		unlawful conduct, members of the Damages Class were injured in their business and property and are threatened with further injury.  d. Accordingly, Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class seek all forms of relief available under S.D. Codified Laws § 37-1-3.1.	
Tennessee  Tenn. Code Ann. § 47-25-101, et seq.	Antitrust	Defendants have entered into an unlawful agreement in restraint of trade in violation of Tenn. Code Ann. § 47-25-101 with respect to purchases of Granulated Sugar in Tennessee by members of the Damages Class and/or purchases of Granulated Sugar by members of the Damages Class who resided in Tennessee at the time of their purchase.  a. Defendants' combination or conspiracy had the following effects: (1) Granulated Sugar price competition was restrained, suppressed, and/or eliminated in Tennessee; (2) Prices for Granulated Sugar sold by the Producer Defendants were raised, fixed, maintained, or stabilized to or at artificially high, non-competitive levels throughout Tennessee; (3) Commercial entities that purchased Granulated Sugar indirectly from the Producer Defendants or their coconspirators were deprived of the benefits of free and open competition; and (4) Members of the Damages Class paid supra-competitive, artificially inflated prices for Granulated Sugar.	Damages. Tenn. Code Ann. § 47-25-106(a).

State/Territory and Applicable Statute	Type of Claim	Supporting Allegations	Relief Sought
Utah Utah Code Ann. § 76-10-3104, et seq.	Antitrust	<ul> <li>b. During the Class Period, Defendants' illegal conduct substantially affected Tennessee's commerce.</li> <li>c. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, members of the Damages Class were injured in their business and property and are threatened with further injury.</li> <li>d. Accordingly, Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class seek all forms of relief available under Tenn. Code Ann. § 47-25-101.</li> <li>Defendants have entered into an unlawful agreement in restraint of trade in violation of Utah Code Ann. § 76-10-3104 with respect to purchases of Granulated Sugar in Utah by members of the Damages Class and/or purchases of Granulated Sugar by members of the Damages Class who resided in Utah at the time of their purchase.</li> <li>a. Defendants' combination or conspiracy had the following effects: (1) Granulated Sugar price competition was restrained, suppressed, and/or eliminated in Utah; (2) Prices for Granulated Sugar sold by the Producer Defendants were raised, fixed, maintained, or stabilized to or at artificially high, noncompetitive levels throughout Utah; (3) Commercial entities that purchased Granulated Sugar indirectly from the Producer Defendants or their co-conspirators were deprived of the benefits of free and open</li> </ul>	Damages (to be trebled as permitted by Utah's antitrust law), costs, attorneys' fees. Utah Code Ann. § 76-10-3109.

State/Territory	Type of	Supporting Allegations	Relief Sought
and Applicable Statute	Claim		
		competition; and (4) Members of the Damages Class paid supra-competitive, artificially inflated prices for Granulated Sugar.  b. During the Class Period, Defendants' illegal conduct substantially affected Utah's commerce.  c. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, members of the Damages Class were injured in their business and property and are threatened with further injury.  d. Accordingly, Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class seek all forms of	
Vermont	Antitrust	relief available under Utah Code Ann. § 76-10-3104.  Defendants have entered into an unlawful agreement in	Damages, exemplary
vermont	Allillust	restraint of trade in violation of 9 Vermont Stat. Ann. § 2453	damages (to be trebled
9 Vermont Stat.		with respect to purchases of Granulated Sugar in Vermont by	as permitted by
Ann. § 2453, et		members of the Damages Class and/or purchases of	Vermont's antitrust
seq.		Granulated Sugar by members of the Damages Class who	law), attorneys' fees. 9
		resided in Vermont at the time of their purchase.	Vermont Stat. Ann. §
		a. Defendants' combination or conspiracy had the following effects: (1) Granulated Sugar price competition was restrained, suppressed, and/or eliminated in Vermont; (2) Prices for Granulated Sugar sold by the Producer Defendants were raised, fixed, maintained, or stabilized to or at artificially high, noncompetitive levels throughout Vermont; (3)	2465.

State/Territory and Applicable Statute	Type of Claim	Supporting Allegations	Relief Sought
		Commercial entities that purchased Granulated Sugar indirectly from the Producer Defendants or their coconspirators were deprived of the benefits of free and open competition; and (4) Members of the Damages Class paid supra-competitive, artificially inflated prices for Granulated Sugar.  b. During the Class Period, Defendants' illegal conduct substantially affected Vermont's commerce.  c. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, members of the Damages Class were injured in their business and property and are threatened with further injury.  d. Accordingly, Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class seek all forms of relief available under 9 Vermont Stat. Ann. § 2453.	
West Virginia  W. Va. Code § 47-18-3, et seq.	Antitrust	Defendants have entered into an unlawful agreement in restraint of trade in violation of W. Va. Code § 47-18-3 with respect to purchases of Granulated Sugar in West Virginia by members of the Damages Class and/or purchases of Granulated Sugar by members of the Damages Class who resided in West Virginia at the time of their purchase.  a. Defendants' combination or conspiracy had the following effects: (1) Granulated Sugar price competition was restrained, suppressed, and/or eliminated in West Virginia; (2) Prices for Granulated	Damages (to be trebled as permitted by West Virginia's antitrust law), costs, attorneys' fees. W. Va. Code § 47-18-9.

State/Territory and Applicable Statute	Type of Claim	Supporting Allegations	Relief Sought
		Sugar sold by the Producer Defendants were raised, fixed, maintained, or stabilized to or at artificially high, non-competitive levels throughout West Virginia; (3) Commercial entities that purchased Granulated Sugar indirectly from the Producer Defendants or their coconspirators were deprived of the benefits of free and open competition; and (4) Members of the Damages Class paid supra-competitive, artificially inflated prices for Granulated Sugar.  b. During the Class Period, Defendants' illegal conduct substantially affected West Virginia's commerce.  c. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, members of the Damages Class were injured in their business and property and are threatened with further injury.  d. Accordingly, Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class seek all forms of relief available under W. Va. Code § 47-18-3.	
Wisconsin	Antitrust	Defendants have entered into an unlawful agreement in restraint of trade in violation of Wis. Stat. § 133.03 with	Damages (to be trebled as permitted
Wis. Stat. §		respect to purchases of Granulated Sugar in Wisconsin by	by Wisconsin's
133.03, et seq.		Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class and/or purchases of Granulated Sugar by Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class who resided in Wisconsin at the time of their	antitrust law), costs, attorneys' fees. Wis. Stat. § 133.18(1)(a).

State/Territory and Applicable Statute	Type of Claim	Supporting Allegations	Relief Sought
		purchase.  a. Defendants' combination or conspiracy had the following effects: (1) Granulated Sugar price competition was restrained, suppressed, and/or eliminated in Wisconsin; (2) Prices for Granulated Sugar sold by the Producer Defendants were raised, fixed, maintained, or stabilized to or at artificially high, non-competitive levels throughout Wisconsin; (3) Commercial entities that purchased Granulated Sugar indirectly from the Producer Defendants or their coconspirators were deprived of the benefits of free and open competition; and (4) Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class paid supra-competitive, artificially inflated prices for Granulated Sugar.  b. During the Class Period, Defendants' illegal conduct substantially affected Wisconsin's commerce.  c. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class were injured in their business and property and are threatened with further injury.  d. Accordingly, Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class seek all forms of relief available under Wis. Stat. § 133.03.	

Table 3: State-Specific Allegations Supporting Count V Violation of State Consumer Protection Laws

State/Territory and Statute	Type of Claim	Supporting Allegations	Relief Sought
The state of the s	Consumer protection law, which encompasses antitrust claims	Defendants have engaged in unfair or unconscionable acts or practices in violation of Ark. Code Ann. § 4-88-101.  a. Defendants have knowingly entered into an agreement in restraint of trade.  b. This conduct constituted unfair or unconscionable acts or practices in violation of Ark. Code Ann. § 4-88-107.  c. Defendants' combination or conspiracy had the following effects: (1) Granulated Sugar price competition was restrained, suppressed, and/or eliminated in Arkansas; (2) Prices for Granulated Sugar sold by the Producer Defendants were raised, fixed, maintained, or stabilized to or at artificially high, non-competitive levels throughout Arkansas; (3) Commercial entities that purchased Granulated Sugar indirectly from the Producer Defendants or their coconspirators were deprived of the benefits of free and open competition; and (4) Members of the Damages Class paid supra-competitive, artificially inflated prices for Granulated Sugar in Arkansas.  d. During the Class Period, Defendants' illegal conduct had a substantial effect on Arkansas commerce.	Damages, attorneys' fees. Ark. Code Ann. § 4-88-107(f).
		e. As a direct and proximate cause of the Defendants' unlawful conduct, members of the Damages Class were injured in their business and property and are threatened with further injury.	

State/Territory and Statute	Type of Claim	Supporting Allegations	Relief Sought
		f. Accordingly, Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class seek all forms of relief available under Ark. Code Ann. § 4-88-107.	
California	Consumer protection law,	Defendants have engaged in unlawful or unfair acts or practices in violation of Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200.	Restitution, Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§
Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200, et seq.	which encompasses antitrust claims	<ul> <li>a. Defendants have knowingly entered into an agreement in restraint of trade.</li> <li>b. This conduct constituted unlawful or unfair acts or practices in violation of Cal. Bus. &amp; Prof. Code § 17200.</li> <li>c. Defendants' combination or conspiracy had the following effects: (1) Granulated Sugar price competition was restrained, suppressed, and/or eliminated in California; (2) Prices for Granulated Sugar sold by the Producer Defendants were raised, fixed, maintained, or stabilized to or at artificially high, non-competitive levels throughout California; (3) Commercial entities that purchased Granulated Sugar indirectly from the Producer Defendants or their co-conspirators were deprived of the benefits of free and open competition; and (4) Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class paid supra-competitive, artificially inflated</li> </ul>	17203, 17204, attorneys' fees, Cal. Code Civ. P. § 1021.5.
		prices for Granulated Sugar in California.  d. During the Class Period, Defendants' illegal conduct had a substantial effect on California commerce.	

State/Territory and Statute	Type of Claim	Supporting Allegations	Relief Sought
		<ul> <li>e. As a direct and proximate cause of the Defendants' unlawful conduct, Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class were injured in their business and property and are threatened with further injury.</li> <li>f. Accordingly, Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class seek all forms of relief available under Cal. Bus. &amp; Prof. Code § 17200.</li> </ul>	
Florida	Consumer protection law,	Defendants have engaged in unfair methods of competition or unconscionable or unfair acts or practices in violation of Fla.	Damages, costs, attorneys' fees. Fla.
Fla. Stat. §	which	Stat. § 501.204.	Stat. § 501.211.
501.204, et seq.	encompasses antitrust claims	<ul> <li>a. Defendants have knowingly entered into an agreement in restraint of trade.</li> <li>b. This conduct constituted unfair methods of competition or unconscionable or unfair acts or practices in violation of Fla. Stat. § 501.204.</li> <li>c. Defendants' combination or conspiracy had the following effects: (1) Granulated Sugar price competition was restrained, suppressed, and/or eliminated in Florida; (2) Prices for Granulated Sugar sold by the Producer Defendants were raised, fixed, maintained, or stabilized to or at artificially high, noncompetitive levels throughout Florida; (3) Commercial entities that purchased Granulated Sugar indirectly from the Producer Defendants or their co-conspirators were deprived of the benefits of free and open</li> </ul>	

State/Territory	Type of Claim	Supporting Allegations	Relief Sought
and Statute			
		competition; and (4) Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class paid supra-competitive, artificially inflated prices for Granulated Sugar in Florida.  d. During the Class Period, Defendants' illegal conduct had a substantial effect on Florida commerce.  e. As a direct and proximate cause of the Defendants' unlawful conduct, Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class were injured in their business and property and are threatened with further injury.	
		f. Accordingly, Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class seek all forms of relief available under Fla. Stat. § 501.204.	
Hawaii	Consumer	Defendants have engaged in unfair methods of competition or	Damages (to be
	protection law,	unfair acts or practices in violation of Haw. Rev. Stat. § 480-	trebled as permitted
Haw. Rev. Stat.	which	2.	by Hawaii's consumer
§ 480-2, et seq.	encompasses antitrust claims	<ul> <li>a. Defendants have knowingly entered into an agreement in restraint of trade.</li> <li>b. This conduct constituted unfair methods of competition or unfair acts or practices in violation of Haw. Rev. Stat. § 480-2.</li> <li>c. Defendants' combination or conspiracy had the following effects: (1) Granulated Sugar price competition was restrained, suppressed, and/or eliminated in Hawaii; (2) Prices for Granulated Sugar</li> </ul>	protection statute), costs, attorneys' fees. Haw. Rev. Stat. Ann. § 480-13.

State/Territory	Type of Claim	Supporting Allegations	Relief Sought
and Statute		sold by the Producer Defendants were raised, fixed, maintained, or stabilized to or at artificially high, noncompetitive levels throughout Hawaii; (3) Commercial entities that purchased Granulated Sugar indirectly from the Producer Defendants or their co-conspirators were deprived of the benefits of free and open competition; and (4) Members of the Damages Class paid supra-competitive, artificially inflated prices for Granulated Sugar in Hawaii.  d. During the Class Period, Defendants' illegal conduct had a substantial effect on Hawaii commerce.  e. As a direct and proximate cause of the Defendants' unlawful conduct, members of the Damages Class were injured in their business and property and are threatened with further injury.  f. Accordingly, Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class seek all forms of relief available under Haw. Rev. Stat. § 480-2.	
Illinois	Consumer protection law,	Defendants have engaged in unfair methods of competition or unfair acts or practices in violation of 815 Ill. Comp. Stat.	Damages, costs, attorneys' fees. 815 III.
815 Ill. Comp. Stat. Ann. 505/2, et seq.	which encompasses antitrust claims	Ann. 505/2.  a. Defendants have knowingly entered into an agreement in restraint of trade.	Comp. Stat. Ann. 505/10a(a), (c).
50312, et seq.	difference claims	b. This conduct constituted unfair methods of competition or unfair acts or practices in violation of 815 Ill. Comp. Stat. Ann. 505/2.	

State/Territory and Statute	Type of Claim	Supporting Allegations	Relief Sought
		<ul> <li>c. Defendants' combination or conspiracy had the following effects: (1) Granulated Sugar price competition was restrained, suppressed, and/or eliminated in Illinois; (2) Prices for Granulated Sugar sold by the Producer Defendants were raised, fixed, maintained, or stabilized to or at artificially high, noncompetitive levels throughout Illinois; (3) Commercial entities that purchased Granulated Sugar indirectly from the Producer Defendants or their co-conspirators were deprived of the benefits of free and open competition; and (4) Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class paid supra-competitive, artificially inflated prices for Granulated Sugar in Illinois.</li> <li>d. During the Class Period, Defendants' illegal conduct had a substantial effect on Illinois commerce.</li> <li>e. As a direct and proximate cause of the Defendants' unlawful conduct, Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class were injured in their business and property and are threatened with further injury.</li> <li>f. Accordingly, Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class seek all forms of relief available under 815 Ill. Comp. Stat. Ann.</li> </ul>	
Minnesota	Consumer	505/10a.  Defendants have engaged in unfair methods of competition or	Damages, costs

State/Territory and Statute	Type of Claim	Supporting Allegations	Relief Sought
Minn. Stat. § 325F.69, et seq.	protection law, which encompasses antitrust claims	<ul> <li>unfair or unconscionable acts or practices in violation of Minn. Stat. § 325F.69.</li> <li>a. Defendants have knowingly entered into an agreement in restraint of trade.</li> <li>b. This conduct constituted unfair methods of competition or unfair or unconscionable acts or practices in violation of Minn. Stat. § 325F.69.</li> <li>c. Defendants' combination or conspiracy had the following effects: (1) Granulated Sugar price competition was restrained, suppressed, and/or eliminated in Minnesota; (2) Prices for Granulated Sugar sold by the Producer Defendants were raised, fixed, maintained, or stabilized to or at artificially high, non-competitive levels throughout Minnesota; (3) Commercial entities that purchased Granulated Sugar indirectly from the Producer Defendants or their co-conspirators were deprived of the benefits of free and open competition; and (4) Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class paid supra-competitive, artificially inflated prices for Granulated Sugar in Minnesota.</li> <li>d. During the Class Period, Defendants' illegal conduct had a substantial effect on Minnesota commerce.</li> <li>e. As a direct and proximate cause of the Defendants' unlawful conduct, Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class were</li> </ul>	(including costs of investigation), attorneys' fees. Minn. Stat. § 8.31, subd. 3.

State/Territory and Statute	Type of Claim	Supporting Allegations	Relief Sought
		injured in their business and property and are threatened with further injury.  f. Accordingly, Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class seek all forms of relief available under Minn. Stat. § 325F.69.	
Nebraska	Consumer protection law,	Defendants have engaged in unfair methods of competition or unfair acts or practices in violation of Neb. Rev. Stat. § 59-	Damages, costs, attorneys' fees. Neb.
Neb. Rev. Stat. § 59-1602, et seq.	which encompasses antitrust claims	<ul> <li>a. Defendants have knowingly entered into an agreement in restraint of trade.</li> <li>b. This conduct constituted unfair methods of competition or unfair acts or practices in violation of Neb. Rev. Stat. § 59-1602.</li> <li>c. Defendants' combination or conspiracy had the following effects: (1) Granulated Sugar price competition was restrained, suppressed, and/or eliminated in Nebraska; (2) Prices for Granulated Sugar sold by the Producer Defendants were raised, fixed, maintained, or stabilized to or at artificially high, non-competitive levels throughout Nebraska; (3) Commercial entities that purchased Granulated Sugar indirectly from the Producer Defendants or their coconspirators were deprived of the benefits of free and open competition; and (4) Members of the Damages Class paid supra-competitive, artificially inflated prices for Granulated Sugar in Nebraska.</li> </ul>	Rev. Stat. § 59-1609.

State/Territory	Type of Claim	Supporting Allegations	Relief Sought
and Statute			
		<ul> <li>d. During the Class Period, Defendants' illegal conduct had a substantial effect on Nebraska commerce.</li> <li>e. As a direct and proximate cause of the Defendants' unlawful conduct, members of the Damages Class were injured in their business and property and are threatened with further injury.</li> <li>f. Accordingly, Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class seek all forms of relief available under Neb. Rev. Stat. § 59-1602.</li> </ul>	
Nevada	Consumer protection law,	Defendants have engaged in unfair or unconscionable acts or practices in violation of Nev. Rev. Stat. § 598.0923.	Damages, costs, attorneys' fees. Nev.
Nev. Rev. Stat. § 598.0923, et seq.	which encompasses antitrust claims	<ul> <li>a. Defendants have knowingly entered into an agreement in restraint of trade.</li> <li>b. This conduct constituted unfair or unconscionable acts or practices in violation of Nev. Rev. Stat. § 598.0923.</li> <li>c. Defendants' combination or conspiracy had the following effects: (1) Granulated Sugar price competition was restrained, suppressed, and/or eliminated in Nevada; (2) Prices for Granulated Sugar sold by the Producer Defendants were raised, fixed, maintained, or stabilized to or at artificially high, noncompetitive levels throughout Nevada; (3) Commercial entities that purchased Granulated Sugar indirectly from the Producer Defendants or their coconspirators were deprived of the benefits of free and open competition; and (4) Members of the Damages</li> </ul>	Rev. Stat. § 41.600.1.

Type of Claim	Supporting Allegations	Relief Sought
Consumer protection law, which encompasses antitrust claims	Class paid supra-competitive, artificially inflated prices for Granulated Sugar in Nevada.  d. During the Class Period, Defendants' illegal conduct had a substantial effect on Nevada commerce.  e. As a direct and proximate cause of the Defendants' unlawful conduct, members of the Damages Class were injured in their business and property and are threatened with further injury.  f. Accordingly, Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class seek all forms of relief available under Nev. Rev. Stat. § 598.0923.  Defendants have engaged in unfair or unconscionable acts or practices in violation of N.M. Stat. Ann. § 57-12-3.  a. Defendants have knowingly entered into an agreement in restraint of trade.  b. This conduct constituted unfair or unconscionable acts or practices in violation of N.M. Stat. Ann. § 57-12-3.  c. Defendants' combination or conspiracy had the following effects: (1) Granulated Sugar price competition was restrained, suppressed, and/or eliminated in New Mexico: (2) Prices for Granulated	Damages (to be trebled as permitted by New Mexico's consumer protection law), costs, attorneys' fees. N.M. Stat. Ann. § 57-12-10.
	Sugar sold by the Producer Defendants were raised, fixed, maintained, or stabilized to or at artificially high, non-competitive levels throughout New Mexico; (3) Commercial entities that purchased Granulated	
	Consumer protection law, which encompasses	Class paid supra-competitive, artificially inflated prices for Granulated Sugar in Nevada.  d. During the Class Period, Defendants' illegal conduct had a substantial effect on Nevada commerce.  e. As a direct and proximate cause of the Defendants' unlawful conduct, members of the Damages Class were injured in their business and property and are threatened with further injury.  f. Accordingly, Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class seek all forms of relief available under Nev. Rev. Stat. § 598.0923.  Consumer protection law, which encompasses antitrust claims  Defendants have engaged in unfair or unconscionable acts or practices in violation of N.M. Stat. Ann. § 57-12-3.  a. Defendants have knowingly entered into an agreement in restraint of trade.  b. This conduct constituted unfair or unconscionable acts or practices in violation of N.M. Stat. Ann. § 57-12-3.  c. Defendants' combination or conspiracy had the following effects: (1) Granulated Sugar price competition was restrained, suppressed, and/or eliminated in New Mexico; (2) Prices for Granulated Sugar sold by the Producer Defendants were raised, fixed, maintained, or stabilized to or at artificially high, non-competitive levels throughout New Mexico;

State/Territory	Type of Claim	Supporting Allegations	Relief Sought
and Statute			
		co-conspirators were deprived of the benefits of free and open competition; and (4) Members of the Damages Class paid supra-competitive, artificially inflated prices for Granulated Sugar in New Mexico.  d. During the Class Period, Defendants' illegal conduct had a substantial effect on New Mexico commerce.  e. As a direct and proximate cause of the Defendants' unlawful conduct, members of the Damages Class were injured in their business and property and are threatened with further injury.  f. Accordingly, Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs	
		and members of the Damages Class seek all forms of	
		relief available under N.M. Stat. Ann. § 57-12-3.	
North Carolina	Consumer	Defendants have engaged in unfair methods of competition or	Damages (to be
	protection law,	unfair acts or practices in violation of N.C. Gen. Stat. § 75-	trebled as permitted
N.C. Gen. Stat.	which	1.1.	by North Carolina's
§ 75-1.1, et seq.	encompasses antitrust claims	<ul><li>a. Defendants have knowingly entered into an agreement in restraint of trade.</li><li>b. This conduct constituted unfair methods of</li></ul>	consumer protection law), costs, attorneys' fees. N.C. Gen. Stat.
		competition or unfair acts or practices in violation of N.C. Gen. Stat. § 75-1.1.	§§ 75-16, 16.1.
		c. Defendants' combination or conspiracy had the following effects: (1) Granulated Sugar price competition was restrained, suppressed, and/or eliminated in North Carolina; (2) Prices for Granulated Sugar sold by the Producer Defendants were raised,	

State/Territory	Type of Claim	Supporting Allegations	Relief Sought
and Statute			
		fixed, maintained, or stabilized to or at artificially	
		high, non-competitive levels throughout North	
		Carolina; (3) Commercial entities that purchased	
		Granulated Sugar indirectly from the Producer	
		Defendants or their co-conspirators were deprived of	
		the benefits of free and open competition; and (4)	
		Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and	
		members of the Damages Class paid supra-	
		competitive, artificially inflated prices for Granulated	
		Sugar in North Carolina.	
		d. During the Class Period, Defendants' illegal conduct	
		had a substantial effect on North Carolina commerce.	
		e. As a direct and proximate cause of the Defendants'	
		unlawful conduct, Commercial Indirect Purchaser	
		Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class were	
		injured in their business and property and are	
		threatened with further injury.	
		f. Accordingly, Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs	
		and members of the Damages Class seek all forms of	
		relief available under N.C. Gen. Stat. § 75-1.1.	
South Carolina	Consumer	Defendants have engaged in unfair methods of competition or	Damages (to be
	protection law,	unfair acts or practices in violation of S.C. Code Ann. § 39-5-	trebled as permitted
S.C. Code Ann.	which	20.	by South Carolina's
§ 39-5-20, et	encompasses	a. Defendants have knowingly entered into an agreement	consumer protection
seq.	antitrust claims	in restraint of trade.	law), costs, attorneys'
		b. This conduct constituted unfair methods of	

State/Territory	Type of Claim	Supporting Allegations	Relief Sought
and Statute		competition or unfair acts or practices in violation of S.C. Code Ann. § 39-5-20.  c. Defendants' combination or conspiracy had the following effects: (1) Granulated Sugar price competition was restrained, suppressed, and/or eliminated in South Carolina; (2) Prices for Granulated Sugar sold by the Producer Defendants were raised, fixed, maintained, or stabilized to or at artificially high, non-competitive levels throughout South Carolina; (3) Commercial entities that purchased Granulated Sugar indirectly from the Producer Defendants or their co-conspirators were deprived of the benefits of free and open competition; and (4) Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class paid supracompetitive, artificially inflated prices for Granulated Sugar in South Carolina.  d. During the Class Period, Defendants' illegal conduct had a substantial effect on South Carolina commerce.  e. As a direct and proximate cause of the Defendants' unlawful conduct, Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class were injured in their business and property and are threatened with further injury.  f. Accordingly, Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class seek all forms of	fees. S.C. Code Ann. § 39-5-140.

State/Territory and Statute	Type of Claim	Supporting Allegations	Relief Sought
		relief available under S.C. Code Ann. § 39-5-20.	
Vermont	Consumer protection law,	Defendants have engaged in unfair methods of competition or unfair acts or practices in violation of 9 Vermont Stat. Ann. §	Damages, exemplary damages (to be trebled
9 Vermont Stat.	which	2453.	as permitted by
Ann. § 2453, et	encompasses	a. Defendants have knowingly entered into an agreement	Vermont's antitrust
seq.	antitrust claims	in restraint of trade.	law), attorneys' fees. 9
		<ul> <li>b. This conduct constituted unfair methods of competition or unfair acts or practices in violation of 9</li> <li>Vermont Stat. Ann. § 2453.</li> </ul>	Vermont Stat. Ann. § 2465.
		<ul> <li>c. Defendants' combination or conspiracy had the following effects: (1) Granulated Sugar price competition was restrained, suppressed, and/or eliminated in Vermont; (2) Prices for Granulated Sugar sold by the Producer Defendants were raised, fixed, maintained, or stabilized to or at artificially high, noncompetitive levels throughout Vermont; (3) Commercial entities that purchased Granulated Sugar indirectly from the Producer Defendants or their coconspirators were deprived of the benefits of free and open competition; and (4) Members of the Damages Class paid supra-competitive, artificially inflated prices for Granulated Sugar in Vermont.</li> <li>d. During the Class Period, Defendants' illegal conduct had a substantial effect on Vermont commerce.</li> <li>e. As a direct and proximate cause of the Defendants' unlawful conduct, members of the Damages Class</li> </ul>	

State/Territory Ty and Statute	ype of Claim	Supporting Allegations	Relief Sought
		were injured in their business and property and are threatened with further injury.  f. Accordingly, Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class seek all forms of relief available under 9 Vermont Stat. Ann. § 2453.	
W.Va. Code § wh 46A-6-104, et end	onsumer otection law, hich acompasses attitrust claims	Defendants have engaged in unfair methods of competition or unfair acts or practices in violation of W.Va. Code § 46A-6-104.  a. Defendants have knowingly entered into an agreement in restraint of trade.  b. This conduct constituted unfair methods of competition or unfair acts or practices in violation of W.Va. Code § 46A-6-104.  c. Defendants' combination or conspiracy had the following effects: (1) Granulated Sugar price competition was restrained, suppressed, and/or eliminated in West Virginia; (2) Prices for Granulated Sugar sold by the Producer Defendants were raised, fixed, maintained, or stabilized to or at artificially high, non-competitive levels throughout West Virginia; (3) Commercial entities that purchased Granulated Sugar indirectly from the Producer Defendants or their co-conspirators were deprived of the benefits of free and open competition; and (4) Members of the Damages Class paid supra-	Damages. W.Va. Code § 46A-6-106. Expenses, attorneys' fees. W.Va. Code § 46A-5-104.

State/Territory	Type of Claim	Supporting Allegations	Relief Sought
and Statute			
		Sugar in West Virginia.	
		d. During the Class Period, Defendants' illegal conduct	
		had a substantial effect on West Virginia commerce.	
		e. As a direct and proximate cause of the Defendants'	
		unlawful conduct, members of the Damages Class	
		were injured in their business and property and are	
		threatened with further injury.	
		f. Accordingly, Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs	
		and members of the Damages Class seek all forms of	
		relief available under W.Va. Code § 46A-6-104.	

**Table 4: State-Specific Allegations Supporting Count VI Unjust Enrichment** 

State/Territory	Type of Claim	Supporting Allegations	Relief Sought
Alabama	Equitable	Defendants unlawfully overcharged members of the Damages Class, who made purchases of Granulated Sugar during the Class Period in Alabama at prices that were higher than they would have been but for Defendants' actions.  Defendants received money from members of the Damages Class as a direct result of the unlawful overcharges, and Defendants have inequitably retained this money.  Defendants have benefitted at the expense of members of the Damages Class from revenue resulting from unlawful and inequitable overcharges for Granulated Sugar.  It is inequitable and unjustifiable for Defendants to accept and retain the benefits received without compensating the	Restitution, disgorgement, constructive trust.
Arkansas	Equitable	Damages Class.  Defendants unlawfully overcharged members of the Damages Class, who made purchases of Granulated Sugar during the Class Period in Arkansas at prices that were higher than they would have been but for Defendants' actions.  Defendants received money from members of the Damages Class as a direct result of the unlawful overcharges, and Defendants have inequitably retained this money.  Defendants have benefitted at the expense of members of the Damages Class from revenue resulting from unlawful and inequitable overcharges for Granulated Sugar.  It is inequitable and unjustifiable for Defendants to accept and retain the benefits received without compensating the	Restitution, disgorgement, constructive trust.

State/Territory	Type of Claim	Supporting Allegations	Relief Sought
		Damages Class.	
Arizona	Equitable	Defendants unlawfully overcharged Commercial Indirect	Restitution,
		Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class, who	disgorgement,
		made purchases of Granulated Sugar during the Class Period	constructive trust.
		in Arizona at prices that were higher than they would have	
		been but for Defendants' actions.	
		Defendants received money from Commercial Indirect	
		Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class as a	
		direct result of the unlawful overcharges, and Defendants	
		have inequitably retained this money.	
		Defendants have benefitted at the expense of Commercial	
		Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages	
		Class from revenue resulting from unlawful and inequitable	
		overcharges for Granulated Sugar.	
		It is inequitable and unjustifiable for Defendants to accept and	
		retain the benefits received without compensating	
		Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and the Damages	
		Class.	
California	Equitable	Defendants unlawfully overcharged Commercial Indirect	Restitution,
		Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class, who	disgorgement,
		made purchases of Granulated Sugar during the Class Period	constructive trust.
		in California at prices that were higher than they would have	
		been but for Defendants' actions.	
		Defendants received money from Commercial Indirect	
		Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class as a	
		direct result of the unlawful overcharges, and Defendants	

State/Territory	Type of Claim	Supporting Allegations	Relief Sought
	Ciaini	have inequitably retained this money.  Defendants have benefitted at the expense of Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class from revenue resulting from unlawful and inequitable overcharges for Granulated Sugar.  It is inequitable and unjustifiable for Defendants to accept and retain the benefits received without compensating Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and the Damages Class.	
Connecticut	Equitable	Defendants unlawfully overcharged Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class, who made purchases of Granulated Sugar during the Class Period in Connecticut at prices that were higher than they would have been but for Defendants' actions.  Defendants received money from Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class as a direct result of the unlawful overcharges, and Defendants have inequitably retained this money.  Defendants have benefitted at the expense of Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class from revenue resulting from unlawful and inequitable overcharges for Granulated Sugar.  It is inequitable and unjustifiable for Defendants to accept and retain the benefits received without compensating Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and the Damages Class.	Restitution, disgorgement, constructive trust.

State/Territory	Type of	Supporting Allegations	Relief Sought
	Claim		
Delaware	Equitable	Defendants unlawfully overcharged members of the Damages	Restitution,
		Class, who made purchases of Granulated Sugar during the	disgorgement,
		Class Period in Delaware at prices that were higher than they	constructive trust.
		would have been but for Defendants' actions.	
		Defendants received money from members of the Damages	
		Class as a direct result of the unlawful overcharges, and	
		Defendants have inequitably retained this money.	
		Defendants have benefitted at the expense of members of the	
		Damages Class from revenue resulting from unlawful and	
		inequitable overcharges for Granulated Sugar.	
		It is inequitable and unjustifiable for Defendants to accept and	
		retain the benefits received without compensating the	
		Damages Class.	
District of	Equitable	Defendants unlawfully overcharged members of the Damages	Restitution,
Columbia		Class, who made purchases of Granulated Sugar during the	disgorgement,
		Class Period in the District of Columbia at prices that were	constructive trust.
		higher than they would have been but for Defendants' actions.	
		Defendants received money from members of the Damages	
		Class as a direct result of the unlawful overcharges, and	
		Defendants have inequitably retained this money.	
		Defendants have benefitted at the expense of members of the	
		Damages Class from revenue resulting from unlawful and	
		inequitable overcharges for Granulated Sugar.	
		It is inequitable and unjustifiable for Defendants to accept and	
		retain the benefits received without compensating the	
		Damages Class.	

State/Territory	Type of	Supporting Allegations	Relief Sought
	Claim		
Florida	Equitable	Defendants unlawfully overcharged Commercial Indirect	Restitution,
		Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class, who	disgorgement,
		made purchases of Granulated Sugar during the Class Period	constructive trust.
		in Florida at prices that were higher than they would have	
		been but for Defendants' actions.	
		Defendants received money from Commercial Indirect	
		Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class as a	
		direct result of the unlawful overcharges, and Defendants	
		have inequitably retained this money.	
		Defendants have benefitted at the expense of Commercial	
		Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages	
		Class from revenue resulting from unlawful and inequitable	
		overcharges for Granulated Sugar.	
		It is inequitable and unjustifiable for Defendants to accept and	
		retain the benefits received without compensating	
		Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and the Damages	
		Class.	
Hawaii	Equitable	Defendants unlawfully overcharged members of the Damages	Restitution,
		Class, who made purchases of Granulated Sugar during the	disgorgement,
		Class Period in Hawaii at prices that were higher than they	constructive trust.
		would have been but for Defendants' actions.	
		Defendants received money from members of the Damages	
		Class as a direct result of the unlawful overcharges, and	
		Defendants have inequitably retained this money.	
		Defendants have benefitted at the expense of members of the	
		Damages Class from revenue resulting from unlawful and	

State/Territory	Type of Claim	Supporting Allegations	Relief Sought
		inequitable overcharges for Granulated Sugar.	
		It is inequitable and unjustifiable for Defendants to accept and	
		retain the benefits received without compensating the	
		Damages Class.	
Illinois	Equitable	Defendants unlawfully overcharged Commercial Indirect	Restitution,
		Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class, who	disgorgement,
		made purchases of Granulated Sugar during the Class Period	constructive trust.
		in Illinois at prices that were higher than they would have	
		been but for Defendants' actions.	
		Defendants received money from Commercial Indirect	
		Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class as a	
		direct result of the unlawful overcharges, and Defendants	
		have inequitably retained this money.	
		Defendants have benefitted at the expense of Commercial	
		Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages	
		Class from revenue resulting from unlawful and inequitable	
		overcharges for Granulated Sugar.	
		It is inequitable and unjustifiable for Defendants to accept and	
		retain the benefits received without compensating	
		Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and the Damages	
		Class.	
Iowa	Equitable	Defendants unlawfully overcharged members of the Damages	Restitution,
		Class, who made purchases of Granulated Sugar during the	disgorgement,
		Class Period in Iowa at prices that were higher than they	constructive trust.
		would have been but for Defendants' actions.	
		Defendants received money from members of the Damages	

State/Territory	Type of	Supporting Allegations	Relief Sought
	Claim		
		Class as a direct result of the unlawful overcharges, and	
		Defendants have inequitably retained this money.	
		Defendants have benefitted at the expense of members of the	
		Damages Class from revenue resulting from unlawful and	
		inequitable overcharges for Granulated Sugar.	
		It is inequitable and unjustifiable for Defendants to accept and	
		retain the benefits received without compensating the	
		Damages Class.	
Kansas	Equitable	Defendants unlawfully overcharged members of the Damages	Restitution,
		Class, who made purchases of Granulated Sugar during the	disgorgement,
		Class Period in Kansas at prices that were higher than they	constructive trust.
		would have been but for Defendants' actions.	
		Defendants received money from members of the Damages	
		Class as a direct result of the unlawful overcharges, and	
		Defendants have inequitably retained this money.	
		Defendants have benefitted at the expense of members of the	
		Damages Class from revenue resulting from unlawful and	
		inequitable overcharges for Granulated Sugar.	
		It is inequitable and unjustifiable for Defendants to accept and	
		retain the benefits received without compensating the	
		Damages Class.	
Maine	Equitable	Defendants unlawfully overcharged Commercial Indirect	Restitution,
		Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class, who	disgorgement,
		made purchases of Granulated Sugar during the Class Period	constructive trust.
		in Maine at prices that were higher than they would have been	
		but for Defendants' actions.	

State/Territory	Type of	Supporting Allegations	Relief Sought
	Claim		
Massachusetts	Equitable	Defendants received money from Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class as a direct result of the unlawful overcharges, and Defendants have inequitably retained this money.  Defendants have benefitted at the expense of Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class from revenue resulting from unlawful and inequitable overcharges for Granulated Sugar.  It is inequitable and unjustifiable for Defendants to accept and retain the benefits received without compensating Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and the Damages Class.  Defendants unlawfully overcharged members of the Damages Class, who made purchases of Granulated Sugar during the Class Period in Massachusetts at prices that were higher than they would have been but for Defendants' actions.  Defendants received money from members of the Damages Class as a direct result of the unlawful overcharges, and Defendants have inequitably retained this money.  Defendants have benefitted at the expense of members of the Damages Class from revenue resulting from unlawful and inequitable overcharges for Granulated Sugar.  It is inequitable and unjustifiable for Defendants to accept and retain the benefits received without compensating the	Restitution, disgorgement, constructive trust.
Michigan	Equitable	Damages Class.  Defendants unlawfully overcharged Commercial Indirect	Restitution
Michigan	Equitable	Defendants unlawfully overcharged Commercial Indirect	Restitution,

State/Territory	Type of	Supporting Allegations	Relief Sought
	Claim		
		Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class, who	disgorgement,
		made purchases of Granulated Sugar during the Class Period	constructive trust.
		in Michigan at prices that were higher than they would have	
		been but for Defendants' actions.	
		Defendants received money from Commercial Indirect	
		Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class as a	
		direct result of the unlawful overcharges, and Defendants	
		have inequitably retained this money.	
		Defendants have benefitted at the expense of Commercial	
		Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages	
		Class from revenue resulting from unlawful and inequitable	
		overcharges for Granulated Sugar.	
		It is inequitable and unjustifiable for Defendants to accept and	
		retain the benefits received without compensating	
		Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and the Damages	
		Class.	
Minnesota	Equitable	Defendants unlawfully overcharged Commercial Indirect	Restitution,
		Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class, who	disgorgement,
		made purchases of Granulated Sugar during the Class Period	constructive trust.
		in Minnesota at prices that were higher than they would have	
		been but for Defendants' actions.	
		Defendants received money from Commercial Indirect	
		Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class as a	
		direct result of the unlawful overcharges, and Defendants	
		have inequitably retained this money.	
		Defendants have benefitted at the expense of Commercial	

State/Territory	Type of Claim	Supporting Allegations	Relief Sought
		Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class from revenue resulting from unlawful and inequitable overcharges for Granulated Sugar.  It is inequitable and unjustifiable for Defendants to accept and retain the benefits received without compensating Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and the Damages Class.	
Mississippi	Equitable	Defendants unlawfully overcharged Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class, who made purchases of Granulated Sugar during the Class Period in Mississippi at prices that were higher than they would have been but for Defendants' actions.  Defendants received money from Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class as a direct result of the unlawful overcharges, and Defendants have inequitably retained this money.  Defendants have benefitted at the expense of Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class from revenue resulting from unlawful and inequitable overcharges for Granulated Sugar.  It is inequitable and unjustifiable for Defendants to accept and retain the benefits received without compensating Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and the Damages Class.	Restitution, disgorgement, constructive trust.
Missouri	Equitable	Defendants unlawfully overcharged members of the Damages Class, who made purchases of Granulated Sugar during the	Restitution, disgorgement,

State/Territory	Type of Claim	Supporting Allegations	Relief Sought
		Class Period in Missouri at prices that were higher than they would have been but for Defendants' actions.  Defendants received money from members of the Damages Class as a direct result of the unlawful overcharges, and Defendants have inequitably retained this money.  Defendants have benefitted at the expense of members of the Damages Class from revenue resulting from unlawful and inequitable overcharges for Granulated Sugar.  It is inequitable and unjustifiable for Defendants to accept and retain the benefits received without compensating the Damages Class.	constructive trust.
Montana	Equitable	Defendants unlawfully overcharged members of the Damages Class, who made purchases of Granulated Sugar during the Class Period in Montana at prices that were higher than they would have been but for Defendants' actions.  Defendants received money from members of the Damages Class as a direct result of the unlawful overcharges, and Defendants have inequitably retained this money.  Defendants have benefitted at the expense of members of the Damages Class from revenue resulting from unlawful and inequitable overcharges for Granulated Sugar.  It is inequitable and unjustifiable for Defendants to accept and retain the benefits received without compensating the Damages Class.	Restitution, disgorgement, constructive trust.
Nebraska	Equitable	Defendants unlawfully overcharged members of the Damages Class, who made purchases of Granulated Sugar during the	Restitution, disgorgement,

State/Territory	Type of Claim	Supporting Allegations	Relief Sought
	Claim	Class Period in Nebraska at prices that were higher than they would have been but for Defendants' actions.  Defendants received money from members of the Damages Class as a direct result of the unlawful overcharges, and Defendants have inequitably retained this money.  Defendants have benefitted at the expense of members of the Damages Class from revenue resulting from unlawful and inequitable overcharges for Granulated Sugar.  It is inequitable and unjustifiable for Defendants to accept and retain the benefits received without compensating the Damages Class.	constructive trust.
Nevada	Equitable	Defendants unlawfully overcharged members of the Damages Class, who made purchases of Granulated Sugar during the Class Period in Nevada at prices that were higher than they would have been but for Defendants' actions.  Defendants received money from members of the Damages Class as a direct result of the unlawful overcharges, and Defendants have inequitably retained this money.  Defendants have benefitted at the expense of members of the Damages Class from revenue resulting from unlawful and inequitable overcharges for Granulated Sugar.  It is inequitable and unjustifiable for Defendants to accept and retain the benefits received without compensating the Damages Class.	Restitution, disgorgement, constructive trust.
New Jersey	Equitable	Defendants unlawfully overcharged members of the Damages Class, who made purchases of Granulated Sugar during the	Restitution, disgorgement,

State/Territory	Type of Claim	Supporting Allegations	Relief Sought
		Class Period in New Jersey at prices that were higher than they would have been but for Defendants' actions.  Defendants received money from members of the Damages Class as a direct result of the unlawful overcharges, and Defendants have inequitably retained this money.  Defendants have benefitted at the expense of members of the Damages Class from revenue resulting from unlawful and inequitable overcharges for Granulated Sugar.  It is inequitable and unjustifiable for Defendants to accept and retain the benefits received without compensating the Damages Class.	
New Hampshire	Equitable	Defendants unlawfully overcharged members of the Damages Class, who made purchases of Granulated Sugar during the Class Period in New Hampshire at prices that were higher than they would have been but for Defendants' actions. Defendants received money from members of the Damages Class as a direct result of the unlawful overcharges, and Defendants have inequitably retained this money. Defendants have benefitted at the expense of members of the Damages Class from revenue resulting from unlawful and inequitable overcharges for Granulated Sugar. It is inequitable and unjustifiable for Defendants to accept and retain the benefits received without compensating the Damages Class.	Restitution, disgorgement, constructive trust.
New Mexico	Equitable	Defendants unlawfully overcharged members of the Damages Class, who made purchases of Granulated Sugar during the	Restitution, disgorgement,

State/Territory	Type of Claim	Supporting Allegations	Relief Sought
		Class Period in New Mexico at prices that were higher than they would have been but for Defendants' actions.  Defendants received money from members of the Damages Class as a direct result of the unlawful overcharges, and Defendants have inequitably retained this money.  Defendants have benefitted at the expense of members of the Damages Class from revenue resulting from unlawful and inequitable overcharges for Granulated Sugar.  It is inequitable and unjustifiable for Defendants to accept and retain the benefits received without compensating the Damages Class.	constructive trust.
New York	Equitable	Defendants unlawfully overcharged Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class, who made purchases of Granulated Sugar during the Class Period in New York at prices that were higher than they would have been but for Defendants' actions.  Defendants received money from Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class as a direct result of the unlawful overcharges, and Defendants have inequitably retained this money.  Defendants have benefitted at the expense of Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class from revenue resulting from unlawful and inequitable overcharges for Granulated Sugar.  It is inequitable and unjustifiable for Defendants to accept and retain the benefits received without compensating	Restitution, disgorgement, constructive trust.

State/Territory	Type of Claim	Supporting Allegations	Relief Sought
		Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and the Damages Class.	
North Carolina	Equitable	Defendants unlawfully overcharged Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class, who made purchases of Granulated Sugar during the Class Period in North Carolina at prices that were higher than they would have been but for Defendants' actions.  Defendants received money from Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class as a direct result of the unlawful overcharges, and Defendants have inequitably retained this money.  Defendants have benefitted at the expense of Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class from revenue resulting from unlawful and inequitable overcharges for Granulated Sugar.  It is inequitable and unjustifiable for Defendants to accept and retain the benefits received without compensating Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and the Damages Class.	Restitution, disgorgement, constructive trust.
North Dakota	Equitable	Defendants unlawfully overcharged Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class, who made purchases of Granulated Sugar during the Class Period in North Dakota at prices that were higher than they would have been but for Defendants' actions. Defendants received money from Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class as a	Restitution, disgorgement, constructive trust.

State/Territory	Type of	Supporting Allegations	Relief Sought
Oregon	Equitable	direct result of the unlawful overcharges, and Defendants have inequitably retained this money.  Defendants have benefitted at the expense of Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class from revenue resulting from unlawful and inequitable overcharges for Granulated Sugar.  It is inequitable and unjustifiable for Defendants to accept and retain the benefits received without compensating Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and the Damages Class.  Defendants unlawfully overcharged members of the Damages Class, who made purchases of Granulated Sugar during the Class Period in Oregon at prices that were higher than they would have been but for Defendants' actions.  Defendants received money from members of the Damages Class as a direct result of the unlawful overcharges, and Defendants have inequitably retained this money.  Defendants have benefitted at the expense of members of the Damages Class from revenue resulting from unlawful and inequitable overcharges for Granulated Sugar.  It is inequitable and unjustifiable for Defendants to accept and retain the benefits received without compensating the	Restitution, disgorgement, constructive trust.
Rhode Island	Equitable	Damages Class.  Defendants unlawfully overcharged members of the Damages Class, who made purchases of Granulated Sugar during the	Restitution, disgorgement,
		Class Period in Rhode Island at prices that were higher than	constructive trust.

State/Territory	Type of	Supporting Allegations	Relief Sought
	Claim		
		they would have been but for Defendants' actions.	
		Defendants received money from members of the Damages	
		Class as a direct result of the unlawful overcharges, and	
		Defendants have inequitably retained this money.	
		Defendants have benefitted at the expense of members of the	
		Damages Class from revenue resulting from unlawful and	
		inequitable overcharges for Granulated Sugar.	
		It is inequitable and unjustifiable for Defendants to accept and	
		retain the benefits received without compensating the	
		Damages Class.	
South Carolina	Equitable	Defendants unlawfully overcharged Commercial Indirect	Restitution,
		Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class, who	disgorgement,
		made purchases of Granulated Sugar during the Class Period	constructive trust.
		in South Carolina at prices that were higher than they would	
		have been but for Defendants' actions.	
		Defendants received money from Commercial Indirect	
		Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class as a	
		direct result of the unlawful overcharges, and Defendants	
		have inequitably retained this money.	
		Defendants have benefitted at the expense of Commercial	
		Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages	
		Class from revenue resulting from unlawful and inequitable	
		overcharges for Granulated Sugar.	
		It is inequitable and unjustifiable for Defendants to accept and	
		retain the benefits received without compensating	
		Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and the Damages	

State/Territory	Type of Claim	Supporting Allegations	Relief Sought
		Class.	
South Dakota	Equitable	Defendants unlawfully overcharged members of the Damages Class, who made purchases of Granulated Sugar during the Class Period in South Dakota at prices that were higher than they would have been but for Defendants' actions. Defendants received money from members of the Damages Class as a direct result of the unlawful overcharges, and Defendants have inequitably retained this money. Defendants have benefitted at the expense of members of the Damages Class from revenue resulting from unlawful and inequitable overcharges for Granulated Sugar. It is inequitable and unjustifiable for Defendants to accept and retain the benefits received without compensating the Damages Class.	Restitution, disgorgement, constructive trust.
Tennessee	Equitable	Defendants unlawfully overcharged members of the Damages Class, who made purchases of Granulated Sugar during the Class Period in Tennessee at prices that were higher than they would have been but for Defendants' actions.  Defendants received money from members of the Damages Class as a direct result of the unlawful overcharges, and Defendants have inequitably retained this money.  Defendants have benefitted at the expense of members of the Damages Class from revenue resulting from unlawful and inequitable overcharges for Granulated Sugar.  It is inequitable and unjustifiable for Defendants to accept and retain the benefits received without compensating the	Restitution, disgorgement, constructive trust.

State/Territory	Type of Claim	Supporting Allegations	Relief Sought
		Damages Class.	
Utah	Equitable	Defendants unlawfully overcharged members of the Damages Class, who made purchases of Granulated Sugar during the Class Period in Utah at prices that were higher than they would have been but for Defendants' actions.  Defendants received money from members of the Damages Class as a direct result of the unlawful overcharges, and Defendants have inequitably retained this money.  Defendants have benefitted at the expense of members of the Damages Class from revenue resulting from unlawful and inequitable overcharges for Granulated Sugar.  It is inequitable and unjustifiable for Defendants to accept and retain the benefits received without compensating the Damages Class.	Restitution, disgorgement, constructive trust.
Vermont	Equitable	Defendants unlawfully overcharged members of the Damages Class, who made purchases of Granulated Sugar during the Class Period in Vermont at prices that were higher than they would have been but for Defendants' actions.  Defendants received money from members of the Damages Class as a direct result of the unlawful overcharges, and Defendants have inequitably retained this money.  Defendants have benefitted at the expense of members of the Damages Class from revenue resulting from unlawful and inequitable overcharges for Granulated Sugar.  It is inequitable and unjustifiable for Defendants to accept and retain the benefits received without compensating the	Restitution, disgorgement, constructive trust.

State/Territory	Type of Claim	Supporting Allegations	Relief Sought
		Damages Class.	
West Virginia	Equitable	Defendants unlawfully overcharged members of the Damages Class, who made purchases of Granulated Sugar during the Class Period in West Virginia at prices that were higher than they would have been but for Defendants' actions.  Defendants received money from members of the Damages Class as a direct result of the unlawful overcharges, and Defendants have inequitably retained this money.  Defendants have benefitted at the expense of members of the Damages Class from revenue resulting from unlawful and inequitable overcharges for Granulated Sugar.  It is inequitable and unjustifiable for Defendants to accept and retain the benefits received without compensating the Damages Class.	Restitution, disgorgement, constructive trust.
Wisconsin	Equitable	Defendants unlawfully overcharged Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class, who made purchases of Granulated Sugar during the Class Period in Mississippi at prices that were higher than they would have been but for Defendants' actions.  Defendants received money from Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class as a direct result of the unlawful overcharges, and Defendants have inequitably retained this money.  Defendants have benefitted at the expense of Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and members of the Damages	Restitution, disgorgement, constructive trust.

State/Territory	Type of Claim	Supporting Allegations	Relief Sought
		Class from revenue resulting from unlawful and inequitable overcharges for Granulated Sugar.  It is inequitable and unjustifiable for Defendants to accept and retain the benefits received without compensating Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and the Damages Class.	